A

DISCOURSE

OPENING THE

NATURE

OF THAT

Epiſcopacy

WHICH IS

EXERCISED

IN

ENGLAND.

Wherein are repreſented ſome Conſiderations tending to the much deſired Peace, and long expected Reformation of this our Mother Church.

London, Printed in the Year 1661.

The CONTENTS of the Sections and Chapters in the following Diſcourſe.

SECTION I.

Sheweth what that *Epiſcopocy* is, and how incongruous it is to *State-policy*.

Chap. I.

THe Subject ſtated. Not a Biſhops Name, *but* Office *oppoſed: nor* Office *in* general, *but Such. Such a Biſhop repugnant to* State-policy, Antiquity, Scripture. *The Method propounded for the firſt Section, containing Arguments drawn from* State-policy. fol. 1

Chap. II. *Of our Biſhops* Birth; *how unſuitable to his* Office: *how Hurtfull to Himſelf and Others: How incongruous to* State-policy. 4

The Contents.

III. *A Biſhops* Breeding *not fit for his* Calling: *againſt Rules of Policy. Some Objections anſwered* 8

IV. *Of our Biſhops* Election; *whether ſuitable to* State-policy. *Of his* Office: Principles, *or* Maximes, *by which he governeth: and* Practice *according to thoſe* Principles. 17

V. *Of the nature of* Indifference; *what it is: and in what it hath place: whether* in Re, *or only in* Appearance *to our* Underſtandings. 30

VI. *Where the* Power *of* Indifferent *Things ſeems to be fixed: whether in the* Church, *or not: or if in the Church, How far. Of the Churches Deciding Commanding Power. Of* Doubts, *and how we muſt deport our ſelves under* Doubts. 49

VII. *Of the* Conſequents *to a Biſhops Office: His Relations Upward and Dependances. Of his* Vote *in* Parliament.

liament. *Relations Downward: How repugnant to* State-policy. 57

VIII. *What* Good *our Biſhops can do to the* State, *is examined. Whether they have been or can be friends to* Monarchy, *or* Civil *Government.* 69

IX. *How ſuitable ſuch* Epiſcopacy *can be to* Monarchy, *is farther conſidered. Whether the Beſt form of Church-Governnent be* Monarchical. *Whether other Forms may not well ſtand with* Civil Monarchy. *How* Church *and* State *Government differ and agree.* 79

X. *Who it is that oppoſeth, and exalteth himſelf above all that is called* God. *Who is properly a* Papiſt: *and what is* Popery: *Why the* Pope *is moſt properly* Antichriſt: *How ſuch* Epiſcopacy *differs, or agrees with* Popery. 88

The Contents.

SECTION II.

Conſidereth how Conſonant ſuch *Epiſcopacy* is either to ſound *Antiquity* or *Scripture.*

CHap. I. *Some Antiquities produced by a late moſt Learned and Reverend Patron of* Epiſcopacy, *are diſcuſſed.* 116

II. *Our Biſhops* Election, Delegation, *&c. Examined by* Antiquity. 122

III. *Of* Ordination, *whether proper only to* Biſhops: *or equally committed to all* Preſbyters: *diſcuſſed by Ancient Authorities.* 128

IV. *Of the* Name *and* Office *of a* Biſhop *in* Scripture. *How little, or how much the Scripture makes* for, *or* againſt *Biſhops. Divers Texts are diſcuſſed.* 134

V. *What*

The Contents.

V. *What form of Church Government ſeemes moſt conſonant to* Scripture. *Whether* Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, *or* Democratical. 142

VI. *Of the Conſequents that may poſſibly follow the change of Church Government, Of the great danger of Schiſms, Sects, and Hereſies. Of* One new Sect *to come in the Laſt Daies. Whether Biſhops can keep the Church from Schiſms, Sects, &c. What is, or who are the* Cauſe *of moſt* Schiſms *amongſt us.* 151

VII. *The danger of* Schiſms *and* Sects *more fully diſcuſs'd: the Nature and Danger of* Anabaptiſm, Separatiſm, & Unlicenſed Preaching. *The Concluſion, with an affectionate deſire of peace and union.* 172

A DISCOURSE Opening the Nature of that EPISCOPACY Which is Exerciſed in ENGLAND.

SECT. I.

Sheweth, what that *Epiſcopacy* is, and how incongruous it is to *State-policy*.

CHAP. I.

The Subject ſtated. Not a Biſhops Name, *but* Office *oppoſed: nor* Office *in general, but ſuch. Such a Biſhop repugnant to* State-Policy, Antiquity, Scripture. *The Method propounded for the firſt Section, containing Arguments drawn from* State-Policy.

I Ayme not at *Words*, but *Things*; not loving to fight with *Shadows*. It is not the *Look*, much leſs the *Name* of a Biſhop that I fear, or quarrel with; it is his *Nature*, his *Office*, that diſpleaſeth me.

Nor

Nor yet his Nature, or Office in general; but *Such*, and ſo cloathed, or rather vailed, with ſuch and ſuch adjuncts.

1. For to me the word *Biſhop* ſignifies, either one that is to Preach, Adminiſter the Sacraments, Exhort, Reprove, Convince, Excommunicate, &c. not only in ſome one diſtinct Congregation, his own *Pariſh*; but in many, ſeverall Congregations crowded up together in one ſtrange (and, for long, unknown) word, a *Dioceſſe*.

2. Or one who hath to all this added, not onely the name of a Civil Lord, (with which bare name or ſhadow, I fight not) but alſo a vaſt, unweldy (I had almoſt ſaid unlimited) Power in *Civil Government*; which muſt needs draw on a mighty Train and cloath it ſelf with glorious Robes of long extended and magnifick ſtiles, ſcarce to be marſhall'd by a better Herauld than *Elihu*, who could give no Titles.

3. Or in the laſt place, (which ſhould be firſt) a true faithfull *Overſeer*, that, over one ſingle Congregation, hath a joint care with the Elders, Deacons, and reſt of the Aſſembly, who are all fellow-helpers, yea, ſervants each to others faith.

This *laſt* is a *Biſhop*, of the *firſt* Inſtitution; of Chriſts allowance; ſetled in divers

vers Churches, even in the Apoſtles times.

The *firſt* is of the *ſecond Century*, when Doctrine, Diſcipline, all Religion began to waine. For even then *Myſterious Anti-Chriſt* was not onely *conceived*, but began to *quicken*.

The *ſecond* roſe *laſt*, (though *firſt* intended by the Churches Enemy.) Riſing up while the world was buſie, looking all one way; as amaz'd at the new Beaſt, ſucceſſour to the Dragon.

This is now our *Adverſary*; One monſtrouſly compounded, of different, yea, oppoſite Offices; and thoſe the greateſt, both *Eccleſiaſtical* and *Civil*: for which he ſeems no way able, no way fit; and that for many reaſons, which may be brought from *Scripture*, *Church-Antiquity*, *State-Pollicy*.

I ſhall begin with the laſt, (as that I now aim at moſt.) Here let us view our Biſhop a while as a private man, *before his Office*. Next as a Lord over Church and State, *in his Office*. Then with ſome neceſſary *Conſequents to his Office*; as now it is exerciſed in this Kingdom. Thus ſhall we quickly judge how ſuitable to true *Policy of State*, are either the *Antecedents*, *Concomitants*, or *Conſequents*, of this too officious, two-headed *Biſhop*.

Antecedents to his Office, are his *Birth*, *Education*, *Election*, *Ordination*, *&c.*

Concomitants, (or rather *Ingredients*) we may call, that almoſt illimited power, both *Intenſive*, in ſole Ordination; Juriſdiction (*Directive*; by Injunctions, Canons, &c. *Corrective*, by Excommunication, Suſpenſion, Deprivation, &c.) As alſo *Extenſive*, over ſo vaſt a *Dioceſſe*.

Hither alſo we may refer his power *Juridical*, or Legiſlative, in Parliament; Judiciall in many great, yea, Civil Tribunals. And (of all monſters moſt ugly) his power *Delegative*: then which this ſun hath ſeen nothing more monſtrous, at leaſt as of late it hath been exercis'd.

By *Conſequents* I mean his *Relations*, (acquired by his Office) both *Upward*, to his Soveraign, Creator, Benefactors; as *Downward*, to his own family, Creatures, and hang by Dependants.

CHAP. II.

Of our Biſhops Birth, *how unſuitable to his* Office: *how hurtfull to himſelf and others: How incongruous to* State-Policy.

LEt us begin with *Antecedents*; in them the firſt. Which we ſhall find very

very unſuitable to his after acquired Office. For the moſt part he is *Ex fæce plebis*; *humi-ſerpent*; of the loweſt of the people (an old complaint.) Now for ſuch a low born man, to be exalted high, ſo high, and that not *gradatim*, ſtep by ſtep, but *per ſaltum*, all at once, as oft it is (in one of few, or no School Degrees; which yet indeed at beſt are ſcarce degrees to the Civil honour of a Peer;) muſt needs make as great a *Chaſme* in *Politicks*, as ſuch *leapes* uſe to doe in *Naturals*.

A great Evil muſt it be, and that both *in himſelf*, and *to himſelf* from *others*.

In *others* eye, his honor will be the object, not ſo much perhaps of envy, as ſcorn: while every man of loweſt worth, will ſtill value himſelf at as high a rate, and ſtill conceive he wanted not the *vertuous deſert*, but *fortunate reward*, a Biſhop had. Now every Action will from hence diſpleaſe, ſith unexpected ſudden happineſſe, is oft times *fault enough*.

Now that fitting deportment, which may but expreſſe the juſt dignity of his place, and anſwer the Majeſty of his high calling, ſhall be eſteem'd but pride, inſolence, and at beſt but affectation. And from ſome ſuch diſpleaſing action, or geſture,

ſture, (though but ſurmis'd on ſome groundleſs fancy) oft his very perſon coms to be diſtaſted: and then adieu all effectual good, which his words or actions elſe might ſoon effect.

Sure the cheif Dominion of Goſpel Miniſters ſhould be in that the Lord and Maſter of the Goſpel ſo much requires; *My Son give me thy heart.* If a Miniſter once come to loſe the heart and affections of his people, he may indeed ſtudy ſome way to force their bodies; but ſhall ſcarce ever win a ſoul, or ſave a ſinner. *Homo duci vult, cogi non poteſt*, man may be led, but cannot be compell'd: if you can faſten any *force* on his whole perſon, it muſt be that of *Love*. For ſure the Goſpel conſtraint is onely that of *Love*. *The Love of Chriſt conſtraineth.* This, and this onely is an irreſiſtible Attractive, and incontroulable conſtraint. Thus is the Miniſter, the *Biſhop* hurt, in regard of others.

In regard of *Himſelf*: ſudden great changes are dangerous in Nature: the skilful Graſier, the expert Gardiner, will not tranſlate from barren to an overfruitful ſoil; for this ſuffocates the Spirits, and deſtroys the Plant. The ſudden unexpected news of a ſons life, (which was reported dead) was the death of the Parent,

rent, as we read in Roman Hiſtories.

High places cauſe a ſwimming in the brain: your Falkners ſeel a Pigeons eye. (when they would have her ſoar high) to prevent a *vertigo*. I conceive from this Reaſon, and mainly from this, it was the good pleaſure of the Spirit, that under the Law, when the Church had an influence into ſtate-affairs, the High Prieſt ſhould be choſen out of one eminent family, of the ſtock of *Levi*: and ſome of the Kings of *Iſrael* are reproved by God, for that they choſe their Prieſts out of the meaneſt of the people. He that is to go in and out before the people, and is their Guid, muſt be without blemiſh.

Thoſe Horſes which are deſigned to a lofty Ayre, and generous manage, muſt be of a Noble race. *Non bene conveniunt, nec in una ſede morantur, Majeſtas et Origo plebeia.* Majeſty and a baſe Original do not well ſuit; neither can they dwell together: The Vapours which by the Sun are raiſed to a great height, even to the ſecond Region, being of ſo mean a Progeny, are but the matter of hail, ſnow, rain, ſtorm, and tempeſt, which by Hiſtorians are obſerv'd to be the frequent Prognoſticks, or at leaſt companions, of Wars and confuſions.

CHAP. III.

A Biſhops Breeding *not fit for his* Calling: *againſt Rules of Policy. Some objections anſwered.*

BUt ſome will ſay, this defect (in *Birth*) may be repaired in *Breeding*, elſe we ſhut the doors of hope, (and by Conſequence of *Induſtry*) to *Cicero*, *Marius*, and ſuch other Worthies; who though but of a low Pedegree, may advance themſelves even to the Helm, and there approve themſelves men admirable in the way of Government.

'Tis true, *Art* oft times helpeth *Nature*: ſome men of ſmall beginnings, by their vertues have deſerved for a Motto, and Impreſo, the Poets words,

——*Et quæ non fecimus ipſi,*
Vix ea noſtra voco ——.

That which is not of our own doing, we can ſcarce call our own. But when was this ſeen in a Biſhop?

Let us therefore in the next place examine their *Breeding*, and ſee whether in probability, that be not as diſadvantagious to their Office, as their *Birth*.

Our

Our Education, (if we intend ſervice in way of Civil Policy) muſt be in converſe with thoſe who are therein *Arts Maſters*: or in reading their writings: or laſtly, and mainly, in an happy *uſe* of both. Neither of the two former, hardly both together, can make us ſo expert as Practice. *Scribendo diſcimus ſcribere.* Long, Active, coſtly and dangerous Obſervations are the onely way to make a wiſe Stateſman.

Now when theſe Gentlemen, I mean, the moſt refined wits amongſt them, (for others come not within our queſtion;) deſign the miniſterial function, they either lay aſide *Divinity*, and ſo God is diſpleaſed: or elſe they labour ſeriouſly in the more ſpiritual pathes; and the Common Weale is by them deſerted. For, theſe two, (ſo different) ſtudies cannot goe forward *pari paſſu*, with equall progreſſe. A Miniſter cannot ſerve *God* and *Mammon*.

I know other men think otherwiſe, (of theſe ſtudies) but I conceive the caſe is clear: For ſure the complaints of good men, Canons and Acts of Councils, (forbidding Miniſters to meddle in State affairs) and the Anſwers of our own breaſts prove this truth more than ſufficiently.

You

You ſhall have St. *Auſtin* (in his 81. *Epiſt.*) complaining that worldly affairs diſtracted his thoughts from his calling: and St. *Cyprian* apprehends thoſe great perſecutions were but juſt conſequences of the Clergies guilt in this kind. *Gregory* the great was much troubled to feel himſelf under that load.

Secondly, Canons and Councils diſcover their Judgements fully in this point; ſo *Can.* 6. 8. and eighty three of the Apoſtles. *Councils* alſo do the ſame; *Con. Carthag. Can.* 16. *Conc. Caled. Can.* 3. and thus ſtill they did while Canons and Councils did at all ſtudy the advancement of Chriſts Kingdom.

I confeſſe of later times, Miniſters (like Water-men) have looked one way, and rowed another; ſo that perhaps now you may find Canons of another ſtrain.

But thirdly, (which may anſwer all Objections) let every good Miniſter examine but his own breaſt, his own heart; and then let him ſpeak.

I am ſure, to thoſe who maintain ſuch Prelatical Biſhops, this abſurdity will follow; that to one man the whole power may be given, both *in Civilibus, & Eccleſiaſticis*: a Thing, which God thought Chriſt *onely* fit for; and ſo on His ſhoulders

ders onely did he place the Worlds Government.

Object. Yet ſome will perhaps affirm, Both theſe compatible, and this by example from Gods own Injunctions, to ſome of the Miniſters under the Law, in the Jewiſh Policy.

Anſw. But I anſwer, firſt, there are two main things in which our Miniſtery, and the Jews (of old) do differ.

Firſt, all their ſolemn, externall worſhip, (at leaſt moſt part of it) lay in bodily work, in ſuch things wherein the mind and brain was but little exerciſed; as in offering Sacrifice, burning Incenſe, divers waſhings, &c.

Secondly, That which made their members uncapable of comming into their aſſemblies, was outward uncleanneſſe, (as touching of a dead body, Leproſie, want of Legal waſhings, &c.) and from hence their Miniſterial watch (one of the greateſt works) became as Eaſie, as Outward and Viſible; ſo that even of the inferior Levites were made *Porters*; and to theſe, the Office of reſtraining unmeet Perſons from their Congregation, did belong.

But, now the Work of our Miniſters under Chriſt differeth *toto Cælo*; and that both in publick and private.

In

In publick, it is Preaching, Expounding, Catechiſing, &c. which require mighty workings of the brain, and inward man? ſpecially ſith theſe muſt be done nith Majeſty and Authority; (*Let no man deſpiſe thy youth*) and yet with all ſweetneſſe and gentleneſſe, (*for a Biſhop muſt not be fierce.*)

In private, his work is to compoſe differences, (that they break not out into publick) to viſit the ſick, to comfort the afflicted, (for *Who is ſick* (ſaith *Paul*) *and I am not troubled? Who is weak, or offended, and I burn not?*) Yea, and many more works of this Nature. And all this, beſides the care of his Family, and beſides his private ſtudy, a work too great for any man.

If you then conſider the quantity, the variety, or ſpirituality of the Miniſterial Work under the Goſpel; you cannot but acknowledge it great, very great, and much greater than that of old under the Law. Indeed they diſpute ſometimes, who have not tryed; but a painful Preacher ſtill cryeth out, *Who is ſufficient, who is fit for theſe things?*

In the Cenſures of the Church (though indeed the *Keys* be entruſted with others as well as himſelf, yet) by his learning, piety

piety and prudence, he muſt ſteer all: ſo that he muſt always be awake. *Caveat Dictator nequid detrimenti capiat Reſpublica*, Let the Dictator take heed, that the Common-wealth ſuſtain no loſſe.

Will any man now ſay, that the caſe of a Prieſt and a Miniſter is all one? for, ſuppoſe the Prieſts of old did intermeddle with ſecular affaires, ſhall any Miniſter now from this example, (when the calling is ſo vaſtly different) take upon him *both* functions? If he doe, let him take heed he be not as one that hath taken up the Plough of the Kingdome of Heaven, and then doth the work of the Lord negligently: If ſo, his judgement will be intolerable.

But, in the ſecond place, I anſwer confidently, and I hope truely, that theſe *two* Offices, or Callings, did not under the Law meet in *One*, except in ſome *Extraordinary* Caſes, and Perſons.

Firſt, the old Patriarchs, I confeſs, did exerciſe *both Functions*, in ſome ſenſe, and in ſome ſenſe they did not: (I mean as a *Calling*.) *Abraham* indeed ſwayed the Scepter; but his whole Kingdom was limited to his own Family; and ſo he was a King, and no King; for every Maſter of a Family muſt in the like caſe keep up Government.

I confeſſe he offered Sacrifice; but then, when there was no Law, no Prieſt: and others might have done it as well as He, had they been ſo well inclined. Thus he was a Prieſt, and no Prieſt; for in his Prieſtly Office, he did but what every good man would doe; at leaſt might have done: and in his Kingly Office, he was but as a Maſter of a Family. And ſo it was in the reſt of the Patriarches; ſo that little can be urged from theſe examples. To which may alſo be refer'd that old inſtance of *Melchiſedech*; if at leaſt he were a man, and not the Second Perſon of the Trinity, in mans form; as *Cuneus*, *Molineus*, and many others hold.

Secondly, I find two Judges that were High-Prieſts alſo; *Samuel* and *Ely*: but it ſeems they were thus, by ſome expreſs particular, Extraordinary Command: for God ſaith to *Samuel*, *Theſe have not rejected Thee, but Me*: intimating that he had particularly appointed him to judge, as in an Extraordinary Caſe, which may therefore be no preſident for Ordinary men, in Ordinary Caſes. *Samuel's* ſpecial calling appears not onely from his being devoted before his Birth, and ſtrange call of God, after: but moſt clearly in that he was not (as all the Prieſts were

were to be) of *Aaron*'s houſe; as appears by 1 *Sam.* 1. compared with 1 *Chron.* 6. Yea, and *Ely* too, though of *Aaron*, yet was not of the eldeſt ſon; (whoſe Line by right ought to have had the High Prieſthood) as the Jews diſcourſe at large; and of late *Cloppenburge*, in his Excellent *School* of Sacrifice.

Now *Hoſea* may by ſpecial Licenſe take a Wife of Adulteries; *Abraham* Sacrifice his child; the Jewes borrow Jewels of the Ægyptians, and *Phineas* do juſtice by an extraordinary command or inſtinct but we may not follow theſe preſidents.

Some ſay that inferiour *Levites* did intermeddle in ſecular affairs. But I anſwer, there were *Levites* of two ſorts; out of one ſort, Prieſts were choſen, (out of *Aarons* Line;) the others were like the *Seculars* among the *Jeſuites*. And theſe laſt did (as the Seculars doe) performe the *Civil* part of thoſe *Religious* Services; and nothing elſe that I can find in Scripture or Story.

Laſtly, for the High Prieſts after the Jewiſh Government was broken in pieces, I hope no body will bring them for a preſident: there being then no Viſion for ſpiritual things from God, no more Government for Civil things, according to the Rule of God.

Of

Of thoſe times *Joſephus* complaineth, that the *Chaſmonei* had taken upon them the Uniting of *Prieſt-hood* and *Secular power* in one perſon; which could not be done, but in extraordinary caſes by Gods ſpecial command. And thus I ſuppoſe they will get but little from Gods injunctions among the Jewes.

But ſome ſtill will ſay, that one of theſe Studies may fit for another. All truthes, *Polemick*, *poſitive*, whether Politick, Philoſophicall, or Theologicall, are of neer conſanguinity; and he that is a *Gnoſtick* in one cannot be a meer *Tyrunculus* in the other.

I confeſſe did they improve their Studies to the ripening of Reaſon, and inlarging of their underſtanding, This might in ſome ſenſe be true. But they ſpend their time in Critical, Cabaliſtical, Sceptical, Scholaſtical Learning: which fils the head with empty, aerial notions; but gives no ſound food to the Reaſonable part of man. Yea, their ſtudy is mainly laid out upon books, which they prize, and ſleight as they pleaſe; while they want, *Cotem Scientiæ & ingenii*, the Whetſtone of Learning and Wit, a Real Adverſary, that by contradiction might raiſe their Parts, and much inlarge their

their judgements. Their learning is in *Termes*, it is but *Nominall*; and waters cannot riſe higher than their Fountain.

Anſw. But allow that they improve their ſtudies to be beſt; yet this is not enough: For, State Policy is the Daughter of Converſe, Obſervation, Induſtry, Experience, Practice; and Books will never *Teach* That: but they are but ill Leaders of the Blind, and what will be the iſſue in that Caſe, judge you.

CHAP. IV.

Of our Biſhops Election; *whether ſuitable to* State-Policy. *Of his* Office. Principles, *or* Maximes, *by which he governeth: and* Practice *according to Thoſe* Principles.

WE have ſeen our Biſhops *Birth*, and *Breeding*, with all his Studies and preparations to his Office; to which we have now brought him; onely that his *Election*, and *Ordination* Interpoſe. Of which I might ſpeak much; but becauſe This is the common Theam of all complaints, I ſhall paſſe it here; the rather becauſe it may perhaps be better examined by *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, than *State-Policy*, in which I now am.

Yet by the way I cannot but propoſe it as worthy of State conſideration; how the inferiour Clergie is to yield true *Canonical Obedience*, to one (that *neſcio quo jure*, requires it by *Oath*) though he be oft forc'd on them againſt, and never with their expreſſe will; which they cannot expreſſe, having neither poſitive, nor negative votes in Election. Except perchance the whole Clergie of a *Dioceſſe*, or *Province*, may be fully repreſented by a Cloiſtered Chapiter, among which are uſually the very dregges of loweſt men. Who yet indeed (themſelves) have no Elective votes; but after the ſolemn dirge of *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, are as ſure to find the Spirit in a *Conge d' eſlire*, as others not long ſince, in the Tridentine Poſtmantile.

Certainly, it is to be deſired, that Chriſtians would ſhew as much care and conſcience in ſetting heads over whole Churches, as ſome Heathen Emperours did in ſetting Governours over private Townes; which yet they would not doe, till at leaſt free liberty was given to the Citizens complaint and rejection, if not Election, of the party propounded. And this *Antoninus* learnt from the Jewes, and Chriſtians choice of *Their* Church Governours

vernours in *Thoſe* Times, though now Latter ages are grown Wiſer. But I muſt leave this *Subject.*

We are now come to view our Biſhop *in his Office.* Though we may complain (as one once of *Lewes* the 11.) he cannot be fairely limn'd, becauſe ſtill in *Motion*: which yet in it ſelf might be, at leaſt, excuſable; were he not *nimium Diligens*, too officious, being made up of Two moſt inconſiſtent Offices, the one of *Church*, the other of *State.*

His deportment in *Both*, we may gueſs by his *Maximes* or *Rules* by which he goes, which once ſeen, we ſhall quickly perceive how well he ſquares his *Practice* by his *Principles*: and how conſonant both to true Church or State-Policy.

I ſhall inſtance but in one or two, for we may know *Ex ungue Leonem*, the Lion by his paw. The *Climax* runs up thus.

Firſt, The Church hath power in all Indifferents.

Secondly, the Church is Judge what is Indifferent.

Thirdly, The Biſhops (and their Creatures) are This Church.

If a Prince hath power to Command the perſons and eſtates of his Subjects in caſe of *Neceſſity*, and the ſame Prince be

ſole Judge of *Neceſſity*; it will be no wonder to me, if that people be ever *Neceſſitous*.

If the Church have power *in Adiaphoris*, in indifferent things, and the ſame Church be Judge *Quid ſit Adiaphoron*, what is Indifferent; and this Church be the *Biſhops*; I ſhall not wonder to ſee thoſe things that are purely *Indifferent* made *abſolutely neceſſary*, to the inſupportable burden of all mens conſciences.

But ſome will perhaps ſay, *Theſe Maximes* have influence onely into *Church* Government, and ſo belong not to the preſent queſtion of *State-Policy*.

I confeſſe, did they confine the preſſing of theſe, within the confines of the *Church*, they could not ſo properly belong to the diſpute in hand: but they run over; for the *Maxime* is very large. It is not onely indifferent things in the *Church*, but indifferent things in general, *All indifferent things*; and ſo they may take in what they will.

Again, they do really ſet Laws in *State* matters, under the notion of Indifferent; ſo that all the *Subjects Liberty*, or propriety in goods, *They* compaſs with their *Net* of *Indifferency*; which they make heavy with the plummets of greateſt penalties.

Yea,

Yea, though they medled not at all with ſuch Things as theſe, without their *Horizon*; yet if they make thoſe things to be *Indifferent* which are *ſinfull*, (as they do, I fear) and to Theſe *inforce obedience* with pretence of *Church Policy*, They overthrow all *Civill* Government.

I take ſuch *Maximes* to be the very *Hinges* upon which our Biſhops Practice turneth. I ſhoot not Arrows of Scorn: For truly I have not in my intentions, either by flouts, or jeers, or by a factious Spirit, to deal with *This* Adverſary. *Michael* himſelf would not *revile* the *Devil*: It much leſſe becomes me, ſo to behave my ſelf towards *Theſe* Men (with whom I treat) among whom I know ſo many truly Eminent: I deſire to ſpeak nothing but truth. Yea, I ſhould exceedingly rejoice, if by the Spirit of Meekneſſe, men of that Learning and abilities, (which many of them are) might be reduced to That, which I from my ſoul conceive to be truth, and am perſwaded will be ſo acknowledged by themſelves one day.

If theſe then be their *Tenets*, (as I ſuppoſe they will confeſſe them to be) Is there any thing more *Unreaſonable*, more *Unbrotherly*: more ſavouring of *Self*, than theſe *Poſitions*?

Unreaſonable; For, allow the *Church* hath all power in *Indifferents*, (which I dare not yet yield,) who hath made the *Church* a *Judge* (beyond appeal) *What is Indifferent*? Is not this to bring *neceſſary* and *indifferent* things all under one Notion, If the Church ſhall judge *Indifferent* things to be *neceſſary*, and *neceſſary* to be indifferent? which would to me be a ſad ſtory.

But you will ſay, if the Church be not the Judge of what is *Indifferent*, who may be that Judge?

I tell you, asking of queſtions is no anſwering of difficulties.

But ſecondly, (becauſe I love to deal plainly) I will tell you who ſhall be judge in expounding of Scripture, the *Scripture*; but in finding out what is *indifferent*, *Recta Ratio* right reaſon muſt be Judge.

But who ſhall tell us what is *Recta Ratio*? I anſwer, *Recta Ratio*. Will any man, if the Church ſhall judge That to be *indifferent* which is not, ſay it is indifferent? or that my conſcience is bound in this caſe? *Ex grat.* I do confeſſe the *hour* when the Congregation ſhall meet, is *indifferent*; if the Church will appoint hereupon *Eleven* of the Clock at night, and *Five* in the morning (in this *Latitude* under which we are) I hope no man will ſay

but

but that it is ill done of the Church; and that neither my conſcience, nor my outward man is bound further in *This*, than to a *paſſive* obedience; certainely all force upon me in this caſe, would be ſin in them.

Object. But they will ſay, this is a thing in it ſelf *Unreaſonable*, and ſo cometh not into the nature of *indifferent* thing.

Anſw. But the Church having ſuch power as is claimed, who may diſpute it?

But ſecondly, this action muſt be conſidered either in the univerſal nature of it, or elſe as it is preſently to be put in practice. If you value and ballance it in this laſt ſenſe, nothing is indifferent, no ſubſtantial nor circumſtantial Being. For we being bound to do That, which *hic & nunc*, in this particular, and for the preſent, is beſt, *That* which is ſo with the circumſtances, will be our Guid, and the Church will have, can have, no power againſt *This*.

But if you conſider things in the univerſal nature, (not cloathed with theſe and theſe circumſtances) then it ſeemeth to have ſome *Indifferency*; and then, if ever, it is in the *Churches* power; and yet even then, the *Church* can go no further than what will be according to *Reaſon*.

For, for a Church to ſay, I will, becauſe *I will*; is moſt *Papal*, Tyranical, and altogether diſpleaſing to Chriſt: but of this more in another place.

Thus their Tenets ſeem to me very *unreaſonable*; They will do more than *Adam* did: He gave *Names* to things according to their Natures; they will give *Nature* according to their own fancies.

Secondly, very *Unbrotherly*; in that they make themſelves the *Church*, excluding all others: in which act, (according to their Tenets) they exclude all others from Salvation, for they ſay, in an ordinary way, there is no Salvation out of the Church; and they in this admit none into the Church, but themſelves.

Moſes was, upon a miſtake, reproved by the Jewes, in that he made himſelf a *Judge*, though in that deciſion he releaſed a Jew. Truly, I know not by what authority theſe *Biſhops* ſtile themſelves the repreſentative Church; for they muſt do it either *Jure humano*, or *Divino*. By the *Laſt* we do not yield; That is the Queſtion in hand: by the *firſt* they cannot; for where do the people, either implicitly or explicitly, elect them, and reſign up their power to them?

It is in their *Convocation*, that they obtain

tain this priviledge? that by the Laws of this Land, is not at all obligatory til confirmed by *Parliament.*

Secondly, the *people* chooſe not *Theſe* Convocation men; but the *Clergy*, and ſo they cannot repreſent the whole Church.

Thirdly, the Clergy have no *free election*, for the Biſhop will appoint whom they muſt chooſe; and this too *Sub pœna anathematis*, under the penalty of Excommunication.

The *Angels* (for the whole Miniſtery of the Church) in the *Revelation*, ſeem to receive ſome particular honour from the Spirit; yet not the power of a *Repreſentative Body*: but *Quo jure humano, aut Divino*, Twenty ſix men ſhall challenge to themſelves, as *proper*, That which is not ſo much as by a *figurative* right, given to thoſe Angels, I know not. And is not this *Unbrotherly*, to intrude my ſelf, and exclude all others from *Their Right?*

But laſtly, it ſavoureth very much of *Self*. For certainly he that will out-do the *Pope*, is grown to a pretty height of *pride*. Now in the Papacie it is a diſpute, whether the Pope alone; or the whole *Colledge of Cardinals*; or a general Council; or the *People*; or *All* theſe; or *Some* of theſe, with their joynt forces, may ſtile themſelvs the *Church*. But *Our men* without diſpute, (like the *Lion* in the

the fable) challenge *All*; of whom the Poet is verified; *Ætas Patrum, pejor avo, tulit progeniem nequiorem*, the Age of our Fathers, being worſe than that of our Grandfathers, hath yet brought forth a more wicked progeny. And yet, whoever takes up Errour at the Second hand will have an ill bargain, though he buy it cheap: he will be no gainer. Errour being like the *Jeruſalem-Artichoake*; plant it where you will, it over-runs the ground and choaks the Heart.

Thus having with the chains of *Indifferency* bound up the peoples *Liberty*; they deal no better with their *Prince*. Onely *Poliphemus*-like, they leave *Ulyſſes* for the laſt. For, when the People are devoured, Kings cannot eſcape. But becauſe Kings are of more prying Spirits, they ſteal in upon them with Sugared bates; ſuch as That of Theirs, *No Biſhop, No King*. But of this more anon.

I might inſtance in many other of their *Maximes*, which I conceive very prejudicial, both to *Church* and *State-Policy*. But I will rather view their *Practice*, according to theſe *Principles* of *Indifferency*. In this I ſhall be very ſhort, not meaning to upbraid them with many monſtrous miſcarriages of late; the rather, becauſe I am

I am confident that God, his Majeſty, and *The* Parliament will not permit them longer to tranſgreſſe in This height.

Onely I cannot but intreat you to obſerve, how by *Their Injunctions* founded on *Thoſe Maximes*, They have impoſed as *neceſſary*, many things that are but *Indifferent*, ſome things that are *Unlawful*.

Firſt, many things but *Indifferent*, they have injoined as *neceſſary*. Some to *Miniſters*, as Caſſockes, Gownes, Tippets, Hoods, Caps, Canonical Coats, Blacks, and many other. Some to *People*, as ſitting with their hats off; Standing up at *Gloria patri*, the *Goſpel*, and other parts of ſervice. Weighty matters indeed, for Grave, Learned, Holy, Reverend Divines to ſpend their time and thoughts upon.

I might perhaps go a little higher; though I muſt confeſſe in ſome other things (now preſt as *neceſſary*) They have had Authority above their own (though I conceive none for ſuch rigid impoſal;) I mean the higheſt, granted by the whole repreſentative State Civil and Eccleſiaſtical: which yet (with all duty to that womb which bare me, and *Thoſe* Breaſts *That* gave me ſuck) hath thought ſome things indifferent, which I could ſcarce ever apprehend ſuch: at leaſt as of late they

they have been enjoined on greateſt penalties. It hath oft made my ſoul bleed, to ſee the greateſt ſins daily committed, without more than a paper check, (that I may not ſay countenanced) while thouſands muſt ſigh in private, with loſſe of ears, goods, eſtates, livings, liberty, all; only for refuſal of thoſe things, that at beſt can be but Indifferent.

But however theſe things may be in themſelves: ſure I am, our Biſhops have preſſed them not onely beyond the Laws intention, but alſo much againſt the meaning of thoſe good men; who in the firſt *Reformation*, did (though perhaps erroneouſly) what Chriſt once lawfully permitted, in almoſt the ſame caſe; allowing a convenient time for Burial of thoſe Ceremonies, which yet appeared not *Mortiferæ*, deadly, though *Mortuæ*, dead.

Yea, and ſome things *unlawful*, by their power They have forced upon *Miniſter* and *People* under the mask of *Indifferent*.

On the *Miniſters*, the Reading of the Book of *Sports*, (firſt invented by themſelves) that monſtrous and prodigious late *Oath*, with divers new *Canons*, not enjoined by *Parliament*, or any other Legal authority. I might add their bare bidding form of Prayer, *Second Service* at the *Altar*, though

(though it could not be heard) an illegal Oath of *Canonical* obedience, (blind devotion) and a new form of ſubſcription before Degrees, Orders, Inſtitutions, &c.

On *Them* and the *People*, placing the Communion Table *Altar-wiſe*; Railing it in, Bowing to it, Receiving at it, &c. For I will now paſſe over their moſt unchriſtian *Oath. Ex Officio*, (fouler than the fouleſt dregs of that cruell *Inquiſition*) at one blow cutting aſunder all the nerves, not onely of *poſitive*, but *morall*, *naturall* Laws, all which (being tender of the leaſt grain of mans liberty) have entruſted us with this *Univerſall* Maxime, *Nemo tenetur ſe prodere.* No man is bound to betray himſelf.

Thus it is manifeſt, their *Practice* is according to their *Principles*, towards the *People.* And they have no leſſe incroacht upon the *Crown.*

Do they not affirm, that in Civil Government, *Democracy*, *Ariſtocracy*, *Monarchy*, are all lawful: and that of theſe, ſeveral people may (at firſt) chuſe which they pleaſe. But for *Epiſcopacy*, 'tis ſtil with them, only *Jure Divino*: in which they ſeem to affirm *Themſelves* to ſtand upon a *ſurer* Rock than *Kings.* In this they err againſt much light; (I fear) but God forgive them.

CHAP. V.

CHAP. V.

Of the Nature of Indifference; *what it is: and in what it hath place: whether* in Re, *or onely in* Appearance *to our* Underſtandings.

BUt that we may no longer be impos'd upon, by This principle of *Indifference*, give me leave to diſcover my thoughts in theſe *two* particulars.

Firſt, What is *Indifferent*?

Secondly, Where the *Power* of *Indifference* is fixt.

Some call thoſe things *Indifferent* which are neither forbidden, nor commanded: but here they tell us onely what 'tis *not*, and *Negatives* make no *Definition*.

Thoſe alſo who affirm that to be *Indifferent*, which may, or may not be done, leave us as much to ſeek, as the former.

I muſt intreat the Reader to remember that we are now upon *Moral beings*: where the Two main *Ingredients*, *Matter*, and *Form*, can be but *Metaphyſically* Notional, and therefore it will be hard to give an exact *Definition*: Seeing even in *Naturals* (whoſe matter *occurrit ſenſibus*, is ſubject to ſenſe) 'tis difficult enough.

Before

Before I assay to give the Nature of it in a Definition, give me leave to present you with some kind of *Etimology*.

In the word *Indifferent*, the preposition *In*, is (They say) purely *negative*, though in other Compounds (as *incipere*, *inflammare*, *incitare*, *influere*, *&c.*) it beareth another sense, which they call *augmentative*. But in the word *Indifferent*, it must *deny a Difference* as much as *non differens*.

But under favour of our learned *Criticks*, I do not conceive that particle, in This place wholly *negative*. Nor can I think *Caninius*, *Martinius*, or other good Grammarians (when they call this preposition *privative*) intend to make it wholly *negative*: but to *my eye*, to *my* sense; in *such* and *such* circumstances.

When a *man* is said to be *Imprudens*, *incautus*, or the like; we may not judge Him altogether *sine prudentia*, *sine cautela*: for *Animal Rationale* cannot be quite devoid of *these*. And therefore if we take *Imprudens* (in this proposition, *Hic homo est imprudens*) in a pure negative sense, the *Predicate* is destructive to the *Subject*. So that I dare not think our Ancestors and learned men would give *Epithets*, or make *Compositions* contrary to all reason.

Such

Such propoſitions are then thus far *Negative*, as by way of figure, to deny any *caution*, any *prudence*, whereas indeed they muſt allow both; except in ſuch or ſuch a particular, ſuch or ſuch a ſenſe.

Such doubtleſſe is the ſenſe of this Propoſition, in the word *Indifferent*: not purely *Non differens*, but in *ſuch*, or *ſuch* a reſpect, it *Differeth not*. Though in another reſpect, it may, and doth *Differ*; even from the very ſame thing with which yet in other reſpects it *Differeth not*.

This Etymology I chuſe the rather, becauſe I ſee the Criticks in all their Etymologies, love to give to each part (in the compoſition) a *Poſitive ſignification*. Which I cannot do here, unleſſe I tranſlate *Indifferens*, *Differing*, and yet *not differing*: a ſenſe which alſo the *Greek* word ἀδιάφορον will fully bear. For (if by other imployments I have not loſt the ſmattering I once had in that Tongue) the phraſe ſeems beſt applyable to a *Medium*, that doth *not fully* or *wholly carry it ſelf off* from *both* the *Extremes*, but *participates of either*.

Such an *Indifferent difference* hath cleerly place in all thoſe *Naturals*, which between two poſitive *extreams* (ſuch as *Black* and *White*; *Hot* and *Cold*) have a poſitive *Medium*, *participationis* (becauſe it par-

participates of both extremes) and *Negationis* too, becauſe it is *neither*. This *Medium* is properly *Indifferent* to either *Extreme*; from which it *Differeth*, and yet it *Differeth not*, becauſe it is *neither* of the *Two Extremes*, yet *partitipates* of *Both*. Thus Lukewarm, as Warm, differeth not from *Hot*, yet differeth as *Cool*; and therefore is *Indifferent*.

This ſenſe of *Indifferent*, being thus made good in *Naturals*; ſome would borrow and apply to *Moral*, *Theological Beings* alſo. So that between *Good* and *Bad*, they fancy an *intermediate* Entity, neither *Good* nor *Bad*, but *Indifferent* to either. As once a *Moderator* in the Schools, being to determine whether *Lucretia* did well in ſtabbing her ſelf; ſeeing that Action Good in many reſpects, and Bad in as many more, concluded thus, *Nec* bene *fecit*, *nec* male *fecit*, *ſed* Interfecit.

But I conceive, ſuch *Indifference* will not, cannot be found in *Morals*, as it is in *Naturals*. The reaſon is, becauſe the two *extremes* are not here (as in many *Naturals*) Both *Poſitive Beings*; ſo that a *Medium* may really participate of *Both*. *White* and *Black* indeed are *Both poſitives*, but ſo is not *Evil*, but onely the privation of *Good*, which is the other extreme.

Moraliſts diſpute how *Paſſions* are *Indifferent*, but they are put on great ſtraites, and limit it onely to paſſions *in ſpecie* (indeed onely in a *Notion*) which yet *in ſenſu compoſito* cannot be ſaid to be ever *Both Good* and *Bad*, or *neither Good*, nor *Bad*, but being ſtil *Good Naturally*, may be morally either *Good*, or *Bad*, *in individuo*, but *in ſenſu diviſo*, not *Compoſito*.

For the ſame individuall action, or paſſion (in man) cannot be ſaid both *Good* and *Bad* (take it in *actu exercito*) in the ſame reſpects; yea, if any *One* moral reſpect, it be *truely bad*, it cannot at all be ſaid to be *properly Good*. For an *Error* or *Defect* in any one *Morall* (though but ſo much as a *Circumſtance*) truly denominates the *whole action evil*; but only a perfect and univerſal concatenation of all eſſentials and circumſtantials too, denominates it *Good*. Even as in *Logick*, any one negative propoſition makes the *whole Syllogiſm* ſuch; when to an *Affirm'd* Syllogiſm, every part muſt be affirm'd. So 'tis in *Morals* too. And hence perhaps the old Stoicks affirm'd. *Omnia peccata* to be *paria*, all ſins to be equal. Which is one of *Tullies Paradoxes*: becauſe, ſaith he, *One* Step *beſide* the *Line*, may as truly be ſaid to be a *Tranſgreſſion*, as a *thouſand*, or

or running a thouſand miles from it. It is well obſerved by *Aquinas*, that as a body is not perfectly ſet *in ſuo bene eſſe naturali*, in its Naturall well-being, by a bare *form* without *Accidents*; ſo neither an Act *in bene eſſe morali*, in its morall well-being, by onely *objecti* and *end*, rightly fixed: except alſo every *Moral circumſtance*, of time, place, &c. rightly concurr.

They who will have our *Vertues* equally *diſtare ab extremis*, diſtant from the extremes, are much more in the right, than they who will have an *Indifferent* thing (ſpeaking of *Morals*) to *partake of both extremes*. Indeed *Vertue* flying from one *extreme*, when it is rancountred with an equal *Evil*, is arreſt *in medio*; as *Iron* when accoaſted by two *Loadſtones* of equall vertue on either ſide, not daring to imbrace *either*, hovereth *in medio*, between *Both*. Or as the *Magneticall needle* about the *Azores*, keepeth it ſelf directly parallel to the *Axis* of the world; and admitteth no *variation*: becaute *in medio*, between the two great *Continents* (of *Europe* and *America*) to which ſome great Philoſophers aſcribe the *Magneticall* vertue, with better reaſon perhaps than others did before, to the *Northern* Pole, or *Northern* Climates.

From all theſe premiſes, we will now aſſay to draw ſome concluſions, that may help us in judging what may be *Indifferent*.

Firſt, it muſt be in it ſelf *Good*, *wholly good*. For, if it have but one dram of *Evil*, it is wholly *Bad*, (as was proved before) and ſo not *Indifferent*. We have found the *Genus* of it, it is *Good*, *Lawful*.

In the ſecond place, to make our approach a little nearer, (if we can) and to deſcend more particularly into the *Differing Nature* of it; We muſt confeſſe it lies mainly in the ſeeming *equality* of *Uſe*. So that it may be thus deſcribed: A thing *Lawful* and *Good*, which (as we think) *may be Uſed*, or *not*: *may* or *may not* be done.

But here we muſt take heed we loſe not our ſelves in *Termes*: For if they mean that ſome things at one time may be done and at another may not; I yield this true: For perhaps this year I may not marry, and yet next year I may, and in ſome circumſtances muſt, elſe I ſin. But in this Hypotheſis Marriage is not generally *Indifferent*, becauſe not generally *Lawful*; but at ſome time lawful, at ſome time not.

If

If they mean the ſame thing, (the ſame act) at one and the ſame time by the ſame perſon *may*, or *may not* be done *ad placitum*, at pleaſure, without offence; I muſt crave leave to diſſent, till I ſee more than now I ſee.

For I conceive two direct contraries, (as to marry, and not marry) at the ſame time, to the ſame perſon, cannot be ſo equally circumſtantiated, that one of them, at leaſt in one circumſtance, (which is enough) ſhall not be better than the other. And if one be *Beſt*, I conceive it paſt ſcruple, that I may not reject that *Beſt*, and chuſe the *Worſt*.

Now if I miſtake not, I am neer the *Apex* of this queſtion, which yet (*Pernaſſus*-like) hath a double *Vertex*, a twofold top.

The one is, whether in two contraries (as *Doing*, *not Doing*) one muſt not needs be *better* than the other.

The ſecond is, whether in this caſe I am not tied to take, and do the *beſt*, but am equally *Indifferent* to *both*.

I will begin with this laſt firſt, In this I know I have many oppoſites, who ſtiffly maintain, that *Optimum non eſt ſemper faciendum*, The beſt thing is not alwayes to be done: amongſt theſe is that good

man lately deceaſed, (to the Churches great loſſe) Reverend Maſter *Ball*, in his *Friendly Tryall of Separation.*

I think it is a ſubtle diſpute, worth the diſcuſſing; for if they mean thus, That which is *Beſt*, is not at all times *Lawfull* to be done while it is beſt; This ſenſe cannot be true, for here the *Predicate* is deſtructive to the *Subject*; for, that which is *unlawfull* is not *good*, much leſſe *Beſt*, at the time when *unlawfull.*

Or, if they mean, that the *Beſt*, (*in Re* in Truth) *is* not always poſſible to be done; they ſay True, but tell me no new thing. For all men will yield this; and in *This* caſe I muſt conſider, what is beſt poſſible to *me*; becauſe I cannot do the Beſt *in Re.*

I ſuppoſe then they mean that which is *Beſt*, and poſſible to me, is not ſtil *neceſſary* to be done, even while it is beſt; but though I *may do* it, yet I may alſo leave it *undone*, and do that which is *leſſe* good.

Here alſo they may deceive us with *Termes*, for they may mean either *Beſt* in *Truth*, or *Beſt* to *appearance.* And when theſe two cannot be reconciled by all my ſearch, I muſt conſider that which *ſeems* (though perhaps *is not*) the *Beſt.*

We

We ſhall now ſoon joyn iſſue. And the caſe is, whether, when I muſt of neceſſity either *do*, or not *do*, or when I muſt do either *This*, or *That*, I be not bound to do what *is Beſt*, (or at leaſt on exacteſt ſearch, *ſeems* Beſt) if it be *poſſible* to be done by me.

If they take the *Negative* part (of this queſtion ſo ſtated) I hope yet they will give me leave to hold the *affirmative*, and yet without offence, till my judgement may be better inform'd.

My grounds briefly are theſe. Firſt, it is *Lawful* to do this *Beſt*; elſe it is not good, much leſſe Beſt; as was ſaid before. Again, it is *Expedient* to do this *Beſt*: or elſe ſome thing (at leaſt ſome one Circumſtance of *Expedience*) is in the other good, which is not in this, and ſo *This* is not *Beſt*, but *That*, at this time; though at another time, perhaps, *This* may be *Beſt*, it is not *Beſt* now, becauſe not beſt expedient and moſt convenient.

So that at this time, *This* cannot be *Better* than *That*, except *This* be not onely in it ſelf *expedient*, but alſo *more* expedient than *That* is at this preſent: for one grain of more *Expedience* makes that to be *Beſt*, which elſe would be *Worſt*. And one circumſtance may ſo alter the caſe, that now

now *That* may be *Worſt*, *which elſe* would have been *Beſt*, as was ſaid before.

I demand now, how I can be determined to that which is *leſs expedient*? though ſuppoſed *equally lawful*, by *Right Reaſon*? All Philoſophers yield, (and it needeth no diſpute) that the *Underſtanding* rectified ſtill dictates to the *Will*, *Optimum faciendum*, the *beſt* thing is to be done. And how is it poſſible I ſhould do well, if I follow not the Dictate of *Right Reaſon*? *Video meliora, proboque; deteriora ſequor.*

See now to what a ſtrait I am brought; If I follow the Dictate of *Right Reaſon*, I muſt ſtill do what is Dictated, as now *Beſt*. And Right Reaſon muſt ſtill (where ſome Action is neceſſary) dictate *That* to be done, which *is* (at leaſt, *ſeemes*) Beſt.

For, if Right Reaſon ſhould ever (though but once) dictate, that this which is Beſt, is not now to be done, but ſomewhat *Worſe*; It may much be ſuſpected Right Reaſon may *never* dictate the *Beſt* to be done.

For, by this Caſe (of one ſuch Dictate) it would appear, that when ever *Reaſon* doth happen to dictate Right, it is but by *chance*, or ſome *fancy* of its own; not by any certain, conſtant Rule, taken from

from the *Nature* of *Things*, rightly ſtated in ſuch and ſuch circumſtances; For if ſo, it muſt ſtill judge *eodem modo*, after the ſame manner, of that which is ſo circumſtantiated. And, if it once vary from this Rule, it will ſeem to have no Rule but its own fancy. And in this Caſe, we ſhall be under *Reaſon*, as under a moſt *corrupt Judge*, that will follow no conſtant Rule (founded on the nature of Things) but onely his own humor; which will give very Different judgements on the very ſame, or like Caſes in all circumſtances.

I ſee but two Things can help them out of This ſtrait. Either, that (though Right Reaſon cannot but dictate that the Beſt in all circumſtances, muſt ſtill be done; yet) we are not bound to follow *Right Reaſons Dictates*, when we ſee them: Or elſe, we be not bound to *ask* Right Reaſon, what it will dictate; but may doe, (hand over head, as they ſpeak) without any Dictate of Reaſon, Right, or Wrong.

But, Both theſe ſeem to me very ſtrange Doctrine. For,

Firſt, If I may but once goe againſt the Dictate of *Right Reaſon*, and yet not ſin, I may go ten thouſand times, yea,

Ever

Ever againſt it; and ſo all my acts may be *Irrational*, and yet not ſinfull: a ſtrange Tenet: and ſure a caſe never to be found but in a diſtracted man; who ſins not, though all his Acts be againſt Reaſon, becauſe His Reaſon is not able to direct him, or at leaſt He not able to follow Reaſon; and in this caſe God requires it not.

And the Caſe is even the ſame; when I Act without asking Reaſons dictate, as if I acted againſt Reaſons dictate. For til I ſee I act *with*, for ought I know, I act *againſt* Right Reaſon, and ſo I ſin.

Not yet, that I think a man bound before Every (though the moſt common) action, to ſtay diſputing for ſome houres or days, til Reaſon hath given its finall dictate. For, this were to turn all practice into bare and nice Speculation. There are many things by common uſe, and by themſelves, ſo clear that at firſt view Reaſon preſently determines. Yet if there riſe but the leaſt ſcruple at the firſt glimps; Then man is bound to diſcuſs it, til Reaſon rectified dictate the action lawful, and Beſt to be done: And til this Dictate, the Act muſt be ſuſpended. For I ſtill thought that a dangerous Maxime in State policy: firſt, to *Do* matters (not like to ſound well) and then to *diſpute* Them: and it ſounds worſe in matters of Religion. I

I have done with the firſt great Queſtion, whether *Optimum ſit ſemper faciendum.*

I come to the Next, whether amongſt divers Things (to be done) There be ſtill one *Optimum*, one *Beſt* : I muſt mean, whether there be any *Optimum*, for more than *One* there cannot be at one time.

We may briefly ſtate the Queſtion thus. Whether at any one time two, or more things, (ſuppoſe to Marry, and not to Marry) can poſſibly be ſo *Equally Good* to me, that *One* of them is not better than the *Other.*

I think not, for I diſpute thus : I muſt be determined to one of theſe two, (having no *Medium*) I muſt Marry, or not Marry. Now I ask what ſhall determine me to either? Right Reaſon (they muſt anſwer) or my own Fancy, Will, or other thing.

I rejoin; if Right Reaſon determine me; either it doth ſo on no good ground (and then I do a groundleſs unreaſonable act, in following Reaſon) or on ſome Ground, whoſe foundation is in *Re*, in the *Thing* it ſelf. For, if we once grant *Reaſon* any Rule, or Ground, but that certain, conſtant Truth, which is fixt in the *Nature* of *Things*; we ſhall make it, of all Judges, moſt uncertain, moſt corrupt.

If

If once I ſee my *Reaſon* judge point blanck againſt *Reall Truth*, I ſhall ſuſpect it ſtil.

Well then, it muſt be granted, Right Reaſon hath determined me (not to Marry) on ſome good Ground, taken from the Nature of Marriage; (not in Generall, for this would deceive me, but particularly conſidered, with all circumſtances *pro hic & nunc*, in this particular, and at this time) ſo that it muſt alſo be granted, There was one, or more circumſtances, which made Marriage more unfit than *non* Marriage (elſe Reaſon hath made, not found a Ground *in Re*, which it muſt never doe;) *Ergo*, of Marriage, and Non-Marriage, One ſtill is *Beſt in Re*, (at leaſt to Reaſons eye) elſe Reaſon doth unreaſonably determine me not to Marry, or to Marry.

And if Right Reaſon have not, or cannot determine me; to which ſide ſoever I incline, and reſt, I ſin; becauſe I act *Unreaſonably*: being determined by Humor, fancy, paſſion, a wilful Will, and not Right Reaſon; The Candle of God, which he hath lighted in man, leſt maugroping in the dark, ſhould ſtumble and fall.

I may now ſtep a little higher; and affirm, that of Two Contraries, or any Two Extremes, *Both* are ſo far from being

ing *Equally* Good, that *pro hoc ſtatu*, in theſe Circumſtances, Both cannot be good at all, or lawfull.

For, if of theſe Two, One muſt be *Beſt*, and but One; and this One now neceſſary to be done (becauſe Beſt) as was proved before; It will follow that the other extreme is now, in theſe circumſtances, not Good at all to me; becauſe unlawfull to be done, while now there is a better in view; though elſe in it ſelf, with other circumſtances, it would have been Lawful, Good, and Beſt.

If right Reaſon determine it be better not to Marry, at this time, and I be ſtill bound to doe what Right Reaſon ſhall Dictate Beſt (as was proved before:) Now in theſe Circumſtances, Marriage is unlawfull to me, and ſo *not Good at all*, at this time, becauſe leſſe good than Non-Marriage. So *Achitophel's* Counſel was Bad, being not good for that time, becauſe not Beſt.

For as Moraliſts ſay, if it be poſſible Man could be neceſſitated to chuſe *One* of *Two* Evils; in that caſe the *Leſſe Evil* would be Good: So when I am neceſſitated to chuſe *one* out of *two* (ſuppoſed) *Goods*, the *leſſe good* would be *Evil*, and unlawful to me, who am ſtill bound (for ought

ought I can yet ſee) to do *Optimum pro hoc ſtatu*, the beſt for this condition.

The *Concluſion* I aym at, through all theſe *Premiſſes*, is this. There is no One Thing, no One Act in all the World, that I *may do*, or *not do*, *ad placitum*, at my pleaſure, all circumſtances conſidered.

For, this Act (ſo propounded) either is Beſt for that time, and ſo muſt needs be done: or not beſt, and ſo muſt not be done; becauſe in theſe Circumſtances, at this Time, it is *Unlawful*; as not being *Good* while a *Better* is in eye, as hath, I hope, fully been proved.

From this, reſults our finall Determination concerning *Indifference*, (which is our Subject in hand:) No Thing, No Act is *Indifferent* in *Se*, in *Re*, in it ſelf in the thing; but either *neceſſary* to be done, (if *Beſt*) or *unlawful* to be done, if *Bad*, or *leſs Good*, *pro hoc ſtatu*.

What ſhall we ſay then? hath the World talked ſo much of *Indifference*, and the *power in Indifference*, and yet no *Indifference* at all, be in the World?

Give me leave here freely to propound my own thoughts, without offence; being ſtil more deſirous to learn than to Dictate.

I con-

I conceive that all the *Indifference* (in the world) lies in our Underſtandings, and the Darkneſſe thereof, (which makes them wavering ſometimes, and doubtfull whether to do or not, ſo that in them ſeems ſome *Indifference* to either extreme) but there is none in the things themſelves, or Actions; which are ſtil either *unlawfull*, or *neceſſary* (if Lawfull, at this time in theſe Circumſtances;) never *Indifferent* in Themſelves.

As then it is in the point of *Contingence*, every thing is either True or Falſe, Certainly *to Be*, or *not to Be*, and in one of theſe ſtil *Neceſſary* in *Re*, and never *Contingent*, yet to *Me*, (who cannot ſee the whole *Chain* of *Cauſes*) ſome things *ſeem Contingent*, that are *neceſſary*. So for *Indifference*. All Things, All Acts, are *in Re*, either *Neceſſary* to be done, or *Unlawful*, but to my blind judgement, (while I cannot diſcern whether I may Act, or may not) ſome things *Seem*, but *are not Indifferent*; and ſo we think (but erroneouſly) that theſe may be done, or not, as we pleaſe.

For example-ſake, ſuppoſe an unskilful Phyſitian have two *Simples* by him, one of which is poyſon, and the other a pretious Cordial; will any man living ſay,

ſay, Theſe are *indifferent* for a ſick mans cure; ſo as he may uſe them, or not, *ad placitum*, without perill? And yet now ſuppoſe the Phyſitian ignorant of both their Natures: they may be ſaid to be *Indifferent* (though not in themſelves) yet to him; who not knowing either, is *Indifferent* to both, and thinks he may apply which he will, without offence; yet if he apply the one, he errs, becauſe 'tis *poyſon*.

So it is in all the Things, or Acts we think *Indifferent*. In themſelves they are poyſons, or Cordials, very good, (and ſo *neceſſary*) or very bad, and ſo unlawful. But while our judgements are clouded, ſo that we ſee not the Nature of theſe Objects, or Acts: we are *Indifferent* (becauſe wavering) between *Them*; but *They* are not ſo *in ſe*, or really to us.

I may conclude then, Nothing is *Indifferent in Re, in Se*; but to our *Vnderſtanding* ſome things ſeem ſo, for want of good light.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. VI.

Where the Power *of* Indifferent *Things ſeem to be fixed: whether in the* Church, *or not: or if in the Church, How far? Of the Churches Deciding Commanding Power. Of* Doubts, *and how we muſt deport our ſelves under* Doubts.

I Have now done with the Nature of *Indifference*, in which I have been the more large, becauſe I found it more abſtruſe than it ſeemed at firſt view; I come now ſhortly to examine *What Power may determine in* Indifference, and *where this Power is fixed.*

To All, I may anſwer briefly thus. *By Divine Right, This Power is, and is not, in the Church.* The Church hath, and hath not, power in *Indifferent* things.

Firſt, the *Church* hath *no Power* to make any one thing *Indifferent* in it ſelf: (that is, to make it, at one and the ſame time lawful to be done, or left undone, *poſitis omnibus circumſtantiis*, all circumſtances being laid together.) For all Things and Acts are in themſelves neceſſarily Good or Bad, and cannot be Indifferent *in Re*, as hath been proved at large.

Again, we cannot ſay the Church hath power to determine what is *Indifferent*. If at leaſt all *Indifference* comes onely from the *Darkneſſe* of our *Underſtanding*, (as before;) It then lies not in the power of all other men living to determine what *ſeems Indifferent* to one mans Underſtanding, ſince he may perhaps not ſee, what they all ſee; *& e contrario*.

We are now reduced into a narrow compaſſe, having only left to be conſidered, thoſe things which *generally ſeem indifferent* (For there is no *Indifference in Re*, but onely in *appearance* unto us;) becauſe neither Scripture without, or light within hath fully cleared, whether ſuch things ſhould be done, or not: or if done, whether in ſuch, or ſuch a time, place, &c. And in ſuch caſes onely Things *ſeem Indifferent*.

Now in theſe *ſeeming indifferents* (which ſure are not ſo many as ſome pretend) the *Church* hath, and yet hath not, power to determine.

All (though but Seeming) *indifference*, is as it were *in medio*, between two *Extremes*, as was ſaid before. Now, when *Neither* of theſe extremes is *neceſſary*, There, (ſpecially where both extremes are doubtful) I conceive the Church hath not power to determin to *either* extreme. As

As ſuppoſe *Black* and *White* colours ſhould be *Doubtful*, whether both, or either, or neither, were *Lawful*: In this caſe (for ought I yet ſee) the *Church* hath no power to determin (any one ſo doubting) to either *Black* or *White*. The Reaſon is, becauſe Neither of theſe extremes are *neceſſary*, there being ſo many *intermediate* colours between both.

But when One of the extremes (between which we waver as *indifferent*) is *neceſſary* to be imbraced, (as in moſt caſes it is) Here all the power Lawful, I conceive can do no more but reſolve which of the Two extremes is *Beſt*; whether it be ſafeſt to Do, or not to Do (whereof one is neceſſary;) to do ſo, or ſo, if I muſt do.

This power (wherever it be) muſt be very warily exerciſed: ſince of *All Two* extremes, *onely One* (as was proved) can be *Lawful*: ſo that one is wholſom, but the other poyſon.

In theſe alſo the Church *hath*, and *hath not* power. If you pleaſe, Thus; It hath a power *Judicative*, (or if you will *Juridical*) but not *Legiſlative*. It may, and muſt determine, (for ought I know, beyond all external appeal) yet again it muſt not determine, *What*; and *How* it *Will*, becauſe it *will*. Nay it alſo hath its

bounds, a Rule to goe by, a conſtant Law (and that *non factam, ſed natam*, not which the Church *makes*, but which it *finds*,) *Right Reaſon.*

So that the Church is like the *Judges* on the Bench in *Weſtminſter Hall* (that have a *Judicative* or *Declarative* power, being entruſted with the explication, application, and execution of the Laws:) but not as the *King* and *Parliament*, who have a *Legiſlative* power: and ſo not only to declare what is Law, but to make new Laws. And yet even this High Court hath one Rule, or Law to go by, (and this is alſo the Law of the Church, even *Right Reaſon.*) And if they, or the Church, ſhould err from this Rule, (which God forbid) we muſt obey indeed, but *Patiendo*, I will, I muſt give *Paſſive* obedience to Lawfull Authority; even there where I dare not, I cannot, I may not, give obedience *Active.*

By the *Church* here I mean, not onely One, or Two, or a Few, of what Rank ſoever; but all, even every true Member of the whole Church. For I conceive every ſuch Member hath *de jure* a Vote in *This* Determination.

But what if after the Determination, I yet diſſent from the judgement of the greater

greater part of the Church, which in all doubtfull caſes, ſeems juſtly to challenge (even by the Law of Nature) a deciſive power; What ſhall I do in this caſe? ſhall I make a Rent, Schiſm, Faction that may fire the Church or State?

God forbid; no, I muſt *Read*, pray, diſcourſe, and confer, with all humility ſubmitting my ſelf to the Reaſon of any man that will teach me; much more to the Judgements of many together, eminent for learning and piety. And yet if after all this, I cannot be ſatisfied in my Doubts (which muſt be Real, and not pretended ſcruples of a factious Spirit) In this caſe, which ſure will be very rare (where right Reaſon is made Supreme Judge) I muſt ſuſpend til my judgement be cleared, leſt that which to another is lawful, become ſin to me: Who cannot act in Faith, while I act againſt, or with Doubts or Scruples.

However in the mean time, I muſt quietly deport my ſelf without faction, turbulent commotion, or uncharitable cenſure of thoſe who diſſent from me, both in Judgement and Practice; well knowing that the ſame thing may be lawful and neceſſary to one that ſees it ſo, which yet to me is unlawful, while I ſo doubt.

In this caſe, I conceive no Power on Earth ought to force my *Practice* more than my *Judgement*. For I conceive the Churches utmoſt compulſive power (which muſt alſo very warily, and but rarely be uſed) is but Expulſion, or *Excommunication*; which yet I ſuppoſe may ſcarce ever be exerciſed on one that *ſo doubteth*: much leſſe *Fine, Impriſonment, loſſe of member, or life*: Except his diſſent in practice hath neceſſarily with it a deſtructive influence into the State alſo, and Body Politick. Which caſe I think hardly ever poſſible, in *Thoſe Things* which can be objects of Rational Doubts: which are only ſuch as the Scripture hath not determined. And in all things not determined by Scripture, (which ſure muſt needs be of leſs conſequence) One that doubts with reaſon and humility, (may not for ought I yet ſee) be forced by Violence.

Give me leave by ſome inſtances to clear my meaning, in all the premiſes concerning the power in Indifferent Things.

Time, Place, and Deportment of our ſelves in the Congregation, are the main, if not ſole things, which bear this acceptation of *Indifferent*: The Scripture not having laid down expreſſe Rules for all particular caſes of *This* nature. So that

that we ſeem left *Indifferent* to the uſe of this, or that place, this or that time, this or that Geſture, &c.

In theſe things (not determined by Scripture) there muſt be ſome determination, becauſe one of the extremes is neceſſary, (we muſt uſe ſome Place, ſome Time, ſome Geſture) elſe all limitation here were needleſſe, if not unlawful, as was ſaid before.

The Church then Doubtleſſe hath power to reſolve here, What Time, what Place, what Deportment, &c. and what they doe herein (though it ſhould prove to be evil) They do by power which God hath entruſted them with.

And yet again, the Church here muſt not command what ſhe will, becauſe ſhe will; but muſt go by her rule, which is *Right Reaſon*; if ſhe ſwerves from this, ſhe errs. And he that ſeeth her error, or doubteth, ſins alſo, if (while he ſo doubteth) he yield her more than *Paſſive Obedience*: and if ſhe force one ſo doubting, I think ſhe ſinneth more.

Now I need not rip up the foulneſſe of our Biſhops miſcarriage in their practice about Indifferent things, which yet hath fully ſuited with their Principles, as was touched before.

For though I ſhould grant (which I never ſhall) that only they, and their Creatures were the whole Church: Yet would they be ſo far from a power of making things *Indifferent* (which yet ſome ſeem to challenge, or at leaſt to exerciſe) that indeed they have no power to determine what is *Indifferent*: ſince it may be very eaſie for ſome men to think that *Indifferent*, which to others ſeems cleerly either *unlawfull*, or *neceſſary*.

Again, in things ſeeming (generally) *Indifferent*, they have no power peremptorily to determin to one Extreme, when there is a *Medium* between both extremes, and ſo neither is *Neceſſary*.

In things ſeeming Indifferent, where one extreme is neceſſary, They cannot determine *pro arbitrio*, as they pleaſe (but by a conſtant Rule of Reaſon) much leſſe by a Tyrannicall club Law force us to do (though we rationally, and modeſtly doubt whether it be lawfull) what they firſt *Make*, rather than *find* Indifferent, and then (by their wonted maximes in *indifferent* Things) make *Neceſſary*, on pain of Impriſonment, loſſe of ears, yea, life it ſelf.

Which yet might be more tolerable, if they onely took a Dictator-like power,

to

to direct our judgements, in things that ſeem moſt abſtruſe, or doubtful (in which yet they make themſelves Gods; for none but God can fully clear, much leſſe force my judgement;) But they ſcruple not point-blank to contradict our Reaſon, and force our conſciences in things extremely manifeſt; as in Bowings, and many other things, which one as blind as he that ſo much commended *Rhombus*, may ſee to be *unlawfull*.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Conſequents *to a Biſhops Office. His Relations Upward and Dependances. Of his Vote in Parliament. Relations Downward: how repugnant to* State-policy.

WE have ſeen the *Antecedents*, *Concomitants*, or *Ingredients*, to our Biſhops Office. Let us a little view ſome of the *Conſequents*, that reſult from his Office.

We ſhall conſider but Two, or rather One with Two Heads, (like himſelf) at leaſt looking two wayes; His *Relations* both *upward* and *downward*.

Firſt, *Upward*. *Neſcio quo fato*, I know not by what Deſtiny, our Biſhops have ſtill depended on anothers Beck.

In

In the time of Popery, they were wholly moulded to the Popes Will; which oft produced ſuch wilful and ſtubborn deportment (both toward their Sovereign and equals) that wiſe men of thoſe times began to perceive how infufferable ſuch forraign dependance would ſtill be in any free State.

Wincheſter was not the firſt, though One, that in *Edward the firſt his time*, profeſſed ſuch univerſall obedience to his Creator the Pope, that he quickly learned to refuſe (that I may not ſay, diſdain) to call the King his *Lord*. And his Treaſons againſt the Kings perſon, made all men ſee how eaſie it was, and ſtil would be, to reduce ſuch Principles into Practice.

Edward the third ſummoned a Parliament to enable himſelf for the Wars he deſigned: But the *Arch-Biſhop Stratford*, (fearing it might injure the Popes Title, if he might not be permitted there *to erect his Croſſe*) refuſed to come, detained his Biſhops, and prided himſelf in hindering his Soveraigns deſign.

Norwich handled the *ſecond Richard* with the ſame pride and inſolence; Levying Souldiers at the charge of the Kings Subjects to fight the Popes *Battles*.

We

We have not forgot *Becket*, and divers other of his temper, but reſerve them to another place.

Under the Reformation; if they have indeed caſt off the *Pope*, (which may be doubted in moſt, but is paſt doubt in ſome) yet they have ever been at their command, by whoſe favour they ſtand, though (with that unhappy bird) they deſign the death of *Thoſe* that give them Life.

This dependance appears in a threefold Gradation.

1. The *Calling* (of the Biſhops now in diſpute) being onely *Jure Humano*, they muſt therefore comply, not onely to fix their *Perſons*, but their *Callings*.

2. When they are inveſted in their Sees the ſmile or frown of the Court, addeth, or detracteth much from their ſplendor, comfort, and emolument.

3. Their further advancement, either to a better Biſhoprick, or Archbiſhoprick, wholly depends on the Princes Will.

Natural ſts obſerve, there is not ſo much appearance of change in many degrees of Entity, acquired by a ſecond motion; as in one degree, at the firſt ſtep from *Non Ens*, to *Entity*. But Moraliſts find

find that one little ſtep of new preferment makes more impreſſion upon low ſpirits, than their firſt Creation out of nothing. Both are well reconciled in our Biſhops Riſing. For what can ſo ſudden unexpected advancement from Nothing to ſuch an Height of Being) ſeem, but a new Creation? ſo that hence ſuch a dependance muſt needs reſult, as is that relation which Nature fixeth in the Creature to his Creator.

Curteſies and *Hopes* are the moſt oyly *Bribes*, and Bribes blind the eies of the moſt wiſe. With what nature ſoever *Obligations* meet, they have an irreſiſtible force. If they deſcend ſo low as men of baſe ſpirits, They there get a ſpecies of *Profitable*; and ſo become like Lime-twigs to little Birds. It was doubtleſſe moſt feelingly ſpoken by the *Slave* in *Plautus*, *Eſculenta Vincula ſunt firmiſſima*, to which the Engliſh Proverb anſwers, *They that are tyed by the teeth are tyed moſt ſtrongly.*

If they meet with men of high rais'd, Generous, Noble thoughts; they yet work much more, (though out of a more ingenuous principle) while a true Noble ſpirit cannot breath under the leaſt ſhadow of Ingratitude: having firſt learned that old Proverb, *Ingratum ſi dixeris.* —— Ingratitude

tude is the higheſt imputation.

How hardly then a Biſhops Conſcience, Judgement, Reaſon, or Will can be *his own*; under not only ſo many *Obligations*, (for the greateſt engagement paſt) but hopes alſo for new favors to come, (either in higher advancement, or at leaſt in continuance of his ſmiles, whoſe firſt frowns may quickly reduce them to their firſt principles of Nothing) I leave it to wiſe men to judge.

To whom alſo I humbly propound, (as worthy mature Conſideration) how fit theſe ſpiritual Lords may be to ſit as Law-makers in That Higheſt Court, by whoſe fundamental Orders (as alſo by the Law of Nature) None ought to have Vote, but *Free-men.*

And how can they poſſibly be deemed Free, that wholly depend on anothers Thought, (for I need not ſay Beck, Smile, or Frown) not only for their firſt Creation, but continual Preſervation in This State, and power of giving Vote in that Court?

But They ſay, This may be alſo objected againſt other Lords created by His Majeſties favour; eſpecially Officers of Court, which yet are not excluded from Votes in Parliament.

I anſwer firſt, *Incommodum non ſolvit argumentum*, the alleaging of an inconvenience, is not the anſwering of an argument.

Again, if the caſe were alike in all theſe (which I yield not) becauſe we are under One (perhaps invincible) Difficulty, muſt we needs run and plunge our ſelves into another? Or being once in, may we not get out if we can?

But thirdly, there is a Vaſt Difference between thoſe who cannot but ſtil be affected with Noble, generous, and moſt vertuous deportment; (being ſtil to live in their Names, Honours, poſterity) and Thoſe, who in their height, are but as *Meteors*, that muſt quickly blaze out, vaniſh, fall, and be no more. Between thoſe whoſe Birth and Breeding hath filled their veines with Heroick noble blood; and thoſe that are ſo much diſadvantaged both by their *Birth* and *Breeding*: though their *Birth* is nothing ſo ignoble as their *Education*; Compared with that Breeding a true *States-man* ſhould have.

For, will any wiſe man living think them fit to give Counſell in Princes Cloſets; to make Laws in Parliament; and fit Judges in the higheſt Tribunals of Civil Juſtice; that all their life time, (before

ſove the *Congé d'eſlire* diverted their thoughts) were wholly taken up in turning (rather than reading) *Aquinas* and *Scotus*, with ſome other ſchool Triflers, before they came to ſome Church Benefice; where ever ſince they have ſpent all their time (that might be ſpared from Tything) in Liturgies, or Canons; Except ſome new ſcruple with ſome of their Neighbours, have call'd them to peruſe ſome Author *de Decimis?*

If you view their Civil Converſe, they have practiſed little but to wrangle down a Sophiſter, or to delude a Proctor, in the *Univerſity*, to ſay Grace to a Gentleman, or acquaint themſelves with a *Reading Pew* in the *Country*. In Caſes of Conſcience, they have ſtudied little, but how with moſt *Compendium*, to digeſt the Oath of Direct and Indirect, in point of *Simony*; and to ſwallow the Vow of thrice *Nolo Epiſcopari*, I will not be made a Biſhop, when God and their own Conſciences wel know, many of them are not ſo ſolicitous for Heaven, as for a Biſhoprick. And are theſe men fit, not onely to rule the whole Church, to Ordain, Cenſure, Suſpend, Deprive, Excommmunicate, *ad placitum*; to govern our Conſciences, by Articles, Canons, Oaths, (and what elſe a Lawleſs

Con-

Convocation may invent;) but alſo to direct and adviſe (I might ſay more) in the Privy Junctо's; to ſit at the Helm, to dictate Laws, *& tantum non*, even almoſt, to ſway the Scepter; which if they forbear to touch, it is but as *Mercury* once ſpared *Jupiters* Thunder-bolts, which he durſt not ſteal, leſt they ſhould roar too loud, or at leaſt burn his fingers.

In the laſt place my anſwer ſhall be thus. Though the Birth, Bloud, Thoughts, Breeding, and all, of a Biſhop were as Noble as any One, or all the Peers; (which none dare ſay) Yet are not, cannot, Biſhops be poſſibly ſo *free*, (and ſo, not ſo fit, to ſit and Vote in Parliament) as other Lords and Members of that Great Body.

For firſt, They that have large Eſtates by Inheritance, and to continue their Names and Families to the ſame Inheritance, are in all reaſon probable with more impartial freedome to provide for the Good of the Common-wealth in general, than thoſe that having little or no Eſtate of their own (at leaſt to leave to poſterity) are not like much to look after the Weale publick, or Good of poſterity; but rather will ſeek to humor the preſent times, (being truly *Filii unius Horæ*, Men of a ſhort continuance) eſpecially to inſinuate

nuate themſelves into more and more favour with their Creator and Preſerver, on whoſe ſmile wholly depends more than their *Bene Eſſe*, their welfare.

My Judgement in This is much confirmed by the obſervation of a truly Noble Gentleman, and moſt-highly-well-deſerving States-man, (R. Ea. of E.) who ſaid, *He had now ſerved thirty years in Parliament, and in all that time never knew but Two or Three Biſhops ſtand for the Commonwealth.*

Again, though all the branches of *Nobility* firſt ſprouted out from the Root of *Royalty*; (Honours being in all Good States, Appendices to Majeſty, and wholly diſpoſed by the Royall hand) Yet Eſtates and Revenues did not; which are the Partiments and Supporters of Noble Honours. And Theſe alſo in Biſhops depend on the Princes Will.

Yea, our Honours and Baronies, though firſt they were granted by the King; yet now being ſo inveſted in our blood, and become Hereditary, They cannot be revoked. In this therefore we are *Freer* than any Biſhop, whoſe Baronies are onely annexed to their Office, and not inveſted in them by Blood.

We have ſeen our Biſhops Relation upward; Let us now view it looking down to his own Family, Creatures and Dependencies. We ſhall ſee all theſe *Conſequents* as unſuitable to *State-Policy*, as were the *Ingredients*, and *Antecedents* to his Office.

A Biſhops Title and Place is High and Splendid, but his Eſtate (for the moſt part) mean and low: at leaſt that which may be left as Inheritance to Poſterity.

Now to what unworthineſſe will not Ambition carry them? When they look on themſelves as *Peers* and *Grandees* of the Kingdom, and again, reflect on their Wives and Children, as thoſe which (after their Deceaſe) muſt ſoon be reduced from ſuch an height (like falling Stars) into their firſt principles; Muſt not this be a Great Temptation, by any means, right or wrong, to ſeek the private enrichment of themſelves, and Families, even much before the publick Good of the Common-wealth; which is never more injur'd, than when it is made to ſtoop and vail to the boundleſſe Ambition of ſome private, low, baſe, ſordid Spirit.

Or ſuppoſe, by penurious living they may in many years glean up a mean Eſtate

ſtate to leave to their Houſe, to preſerve their name: how miſerable and ſordid muſt be their deportment? how baſe their houſe-keeping: how little their Hoſpitality? Which yet not only by Scripture, but Reaſon ſeems much (if not moſt) to be required of the Clergy. Such a Biſhop muſt be as much given to Hoſpitality, as Blameleſſe in other particulars. But alas, how can ours be ſo? Except they can be content to live without any Retinue of Attendance; or be Curſt by Poſterity, brought up perhaps as Lords, but left as Beggers.

Except then it might be with our Biſhops or Biſhops children, as once it was with that *Roman Dictator*, who being brought from the Plough, was content again to return to the Plough, (after he had with all humility, fidelity, and ſucceſſe, ſerved the Common-wealth in the Higheſt Office that State at that time did afford) I cannot ſee why they ſhould ſo ambitiouſly deſire a Lordly Prelacie; which they can neither leave to poſterity; nor carry down to the Grave; nor yet are ſure to keep all the time they live: for of all Riches, thoſe of a Biſhop may ſooneſt fly away.

If therefore our Prelates would ſeriouſly reflect on their own Peace, Credit, and Eſteem; Or the good of their Family and Poſterity; (though they would deſpiſe the Church, and trample on the State with the weale, peace, and flouriſhing proſperity thereof) ſure they would leave the Common-wealth to States-men; and think it honor more than enough to ſerve the Church, and wait on Gods Altar, I mean that Holy Table which may be ſerved by them that attend the Word and Sacraments; though they muſt not neglect this, and ſerve any Other *Tables*.

But *Venales Animæ*, Mercenary Spirits will do any thing to Riſe. Yet I hope our Biſhops do not, at leaſt will not do ſo any more. If ſo, Let them know the *Wheel* of *providence* can run as faſt backward as ever it did forward. In its deſcent, they may perhaps ſadly reflect on a ſerious dying ſpeech of one of themſelves; *Had I ſerved my God, as I have ſerved my Prince, I ſhould not have been ſo diſerted now.* Though I muſt confeſſe, I doubt they have well ſerved neither *God*, nor the *King*. But this ſhall be diſcuſs'd more anon.

CHAP. VIII.

CHAP. VIII.

What Good *our Biſhops can do to the* State, *is examined, whether they have been, or can be friends to* Monarchy, *or* Civil *Government.*

WE have ſeen how much our Biſhop makes *againſt State policy*; Let us now ſee what he doth, or can do, *For the State*; For, Both parts muſt be heard.

It hath ſtil been the practice of theſe men to buzze into Princes Ears, that they ſtrike at *Monarchy*, that are diſpleaſed with ſuch *Epiſcopacy*: Like one of the old Queen's Jeſters, that would box and pinch any that ſtood neer him: and if they returned the like, he would ſtep before the *Queen*, and cry, *Madam, here comes a Traytor to ſtrike at your Majeſty.*

I know it is one of their firſt Canonicall principles, *No Biſhop, No King.* On this Axletree the whole body of Popery is wheeled about. A ſpecious ſhew indeed, and one of their Maſter-pieces of policie; to acquaint and perſwade Kings, of what uſe they are to them.

Sed timeo Danaos, & dona ferentes, I am afraid of the Grecians, when they come with their Gifts.

It is but a Trojan horſe. *Mors eſt in Olla,* there is Death in the Pot. While they ſeem to pleaſe *Kings* they weaken Crowns.

Powers are *Gods Ordinances*; and ſet over us for our Good: And *Kingdomes* certainly have more for them in holy writ than any other Government: Shall Royal Crowns then come and ſtoop to a *Mitre?*

La France ne tombe pas en Keneville. With them a Woman muſt not bear the Crown, and ſhall the Scepter with us bow to the Croſiers Staff? Let it not be ſpoken in *Aſhkelon,* nor publiſhed in the Streets of *Gath.* Hath Chriſtianity abated the Glory or power of the Diadem? Biſhops would, but Chriſt will not.

In ſhort, What is the ſenſe of this Maxime? What can it be other than This, that the *Strength,* nay, the *Being* of a *King,* depends wholly on a Biſhop.

Prodigious State-Blaſphemy! Kings have been when Biſhops were not, and ſhall be yet much more Glorious, when ſuch Biſhops ſhall be no more. Which ſhall ſtill be my deſire for all Kings; but eſpeci-

eſpecially for *Ours*; whoſe Good and Gracious Government, I ſhall pray, may yet endure long, and long amongſt us.

It is much rather true, *If any ſuch Biſhop, no King*; as I hope to make good in my ſubſequent diſcourſe. Otherwiſe (had theſe been only *Metaphyſicall Notions*, or *Mathematicall ſpeculations*) I ſhould not have been troubled more with a ſquare Cap on a Biſhops head, than I am with a Circle ſquared in a Mathematical brain.

It is true, their grand Maſter the *Pope*, ſeemed very officious in ſetting up the German-Franck Emperour, (the Image of the old Beaſt) But it was not long before he ſhewed his Ends. Turn your eye but a little about, and you ſhall ſee an Emperour ſtand barefoot at his Gate; Here one kneels to kiſſe that foot that ſpurneth off his Crown: There one holds the ſtirrup, while that proud Biſhop ſteps up into the ſaddle.

And have not our Biſhops the ſame deſigns with their Holy Father, even to free themſelves from all Power, and to bring all things under their own Power?

What meaneth this Maxime of Epiſcopacy, that a Clergy man cannot fall under the Execution of a Civil Magiſtrate, Except they firſt degrade him; which

they may refuſe to doe as long as they pleaſe? Is not this to exempt themſelves from all Civil Juriſdiction?

What is the ſenſe of This, that for breach of Their (Church) Injunctions, they may *Excommunicate* people, Miniſters, Lords, *Kings* themſelves, whom they pleaſe; But ſhortly this, to reduce all men, (even Princes as well as others) to plenary Obedience to themſelves? And when once they have paſſed that ſentence on their Soveraigne, at their own fancy, I doubt not but ſome of them would be ready to receive the Crown from their kneeling Prince, (as of old) if any King would again ſo far forget himſelf, and lay his Glory in the duſt to be trampled on by ſuch proud inſulting Prelates. Which God forbid.

Their Inſolent words and actions vented lately againſt the Crown, are very ſuitable to theſe *Principles.*

Some of themſelves in open Court of Judicature, have dirſt to affirm, *They were beholding to none, but Chriſt, for the place they held.*

Others of them (and their Creatures) have ſaid they are under no Law of man.

Some have preached point blanck that their

their ſtanding did not at all depend on the Crown.

Others have flatly denied the King to be Head and Governour in Eccleſiaſtical cauſes, over all perſons: though they cannot but know, that this Title was given mainly to exclude any other earthly Head, as it is interpreted by Order of Parliament.

All of them Erect Epiſcopall Courts, ſend out Summons, exerciſe Juriſdiction, Sentence, Fine, Impriſon, doe what they liſt, in their own name. Though All the Biſhops put together (and *Vis unita eſt fortior*) dare not to do ſo; for, the High Inquiſition had a Commiſſion under the Broad Seale) and yet every particular Biſhop exerciſeth Juriſdiction under their own ſeal, by their own power, in their own name; without any Commiſſion, directly againſt Statute, by which they all incur a *Præmunire*.

Indeed they have learnt to faune upon Princes, and would make them believe all this is for their Honour, and Advantage: yet they are but Impoſtors; This is but to ſtroak the Horſe (as the Proverb is) till they are well up in the Saddle: for, at that they aim, and thither would they come; which God forbid.

I could

I could heartily wiſh, the Kings of the Earth would be pleaſed to read Maſter *Broughtons* Epiſtle in his Refining the *Roman Fox*. Or *Nichol. de Clemengiis*, in his Excellent piece *de Corrupto Eccleſiæ ſtatu*. Or that Noble Learned Lords incomparable *Myſterium Iniquitatis*; preſented to our Late Learned Soveraign King *James*: though in ſome late Prints it hath been refined by an Engliſh-Romiſh *Index Expurgatorius*, yet it will ſtill (with the other) repreſent the ſleights of this kind of Epiſcopacie, in ſuch lively Colours, that I believe no Prince will truſt them again.

I need not go far to ſeek inſtances that may fully repreſent how much Our Biſhops have in all ages promoted the Weale, Peace, and Honour of This Kingdom and Crown: For their Treaſons againſt the State and King want not a Regiſter. I could briefly preſent you with a true Emblem of Epiſcopacy *ab ovo ad malum*; from the beginning to the end; and yet not go higher than the Conquerour.

Lanfranck would have conquered the *Corquerour*: and by gentle inſinuations have perſwaded him to ſubmit his Scepter to the Triple Mitre: but, *Etiamſi ſuaſit, non perſuaſit*, though he did perſwade, yet he did not prevail. Art

Art could not prevail, and therefore *Anſelm* went more rudely to work; though *Rufus* forbad him, yet with many thanks and much honor from the Pope, he went to *Rome* for his Pall. After he had often boarded the King in many matters, he ſucceeded ſo well, that he attempts the ſame againſt the firſt *Henry:* and left not til he had cauſed the Scepter to bow, and the Crown to totter.

In *Stephens* time, Two Great Prelates diſpute about Precedency, and at laſt paſſing by the King, they call the Pope to be Moderator.

Beckets heights are well known, and ſcarce parallel'd in any ſtory: Onely as *Henry the ſecond* (that Great Prince) did ſuffer ſore ſtripes here: ſo did the *Duke* of *Tholouſe* in *France*, far joyning with the *Albigenſes*. That was done by a Pope, this by a Biſhop.

King *John* fell (with his whole Kingdom) under an *Interdict*, for ſome quarrell betwixt himſelf and two or three Prelates: nor could he buy or beg his peace, but on his knees, reſigning his Crown to proud *Pandulph*.

In *Edward* the ſeconds time *Gaveſton* was much abetted by *Coventry*, in this a Traytor to his Country.

What

What Prankes *Wincheſter* played with *Edward* the *Firſt*, *Stratford* with *Edward* the *Third*, and with the ſecond *Richard*, *Norwich*, was toucht before.

Henry the fourth was ill handled by *York*, that waged war with him: at the ſame time *Arundell* vowed he would not leave a ſlip of that *Religion* which then he ſaw dawning in *England*.

In *Henry the ſixths* time, *Yorkes* quarrel with *Wincheſter* loſt all that *England* had gained from *France*, at laſt *York* ſides with *Warwick* againſt the *King*.

Edward the fourth had little cauſe to pardon the new Arch-biſhop.

Ely ended better than he began, but it was *per accidens*; for firſt he perſwaded *Buckingham* to claim the Crown, but he refuſing (at leaſt, not daring to ſtir for himſelf) ſets him on *Richmond* the true Heir.

But you will ſay, Theſe were all *Papiſts*, and lived in the dark times of *Popery*.

True, and were not their Soveraignes ſuch alſo? were not Kings and Biſhops of one Religion then? are they more now. Hath a Proteſtant Prince now more reaſon to truſt a Proteſtant Prelate, than a Popiſh King, a Popiſh Biſhop? Let all the world judge. Seeing in thoſe times it

was

was no difference in Religion, but Malignance againſt Civil Government, that produced theſe Commotions in thoſe Biſhops.

But ſince the Pope, and Popiſh Religion is confeſſed to be the Cauſe of all thoſe Treaſons and Rebellions, what if I prove Prelacy and Popery to be the ſame *in Re*, and onely to differ in name? This we ſhall Eſſay anon. In the mean time It is worth conſidering whether Our Prelates be not more like to ſide with the Pope againſt a *Proteſtant*, than *Popiſh* Prince?

I will over-look the dark times of *Popery*; Let us begin with the *Reformation*, (which yet could hardly have entrance, for that ſtrong Oppoſition the Prelates ſtil made) Alas what Commotions have they ſtil raiſed in *Scotland*, and ever ſince the Reformation? We have *felt* what Our Parents onely *ſaw*. They eat, (at leaſt ſuffered) a *ſour Grape*, and Our Teeth were almoſt all ſet on edge. But bleſſed be God that hath delivered That Church and State from Tyrannicall Prelates; and will ere long deliver us alſo.

They did the ſame in *Denmarke*, til one of their Kings did perſwade the people to chooſe another Church Government.

ment : After he had in publick read a *Charge* for three hours long, containing their Treaſons and Rebellions even ſince the time that the Pope was caſt out of that Country.

When I call to mind their Cariage and miſcariage here in *England*, I muſt begin with that of the Poet.

Infandum Regina jubes renovare dolorem ;

It is the renewing the memory of our great griefs and miſeries.

Our firſt Reformation was much oppoſed by Biſhops. *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and ſome others were no Changelings. Yea, we ſhall find ſome *Good* men were *Bad* Biſhops and the *Evil* were intolerable. *Ridley* was too fierce in maintenance of *Ceremonies*. *Cranmer* and *Ridley* both were for allowing Maſſe to the Lady *Mary* : but That Admirable young Prince was even in his Infancy, with King *David*, wiſer than his Teachers : and could weep, though not yield to their perſwaſions.

What our Biſhops did in Queen *Maries* days (Bloody times !) we all know ; ſure it was an unhappy Proverb that was then learnt, *The Biſhops foot hath trodden here.* What they *intended* under the Old Queen *Eſſayed* in King *James* his Reign ; and had well nigh *performed* under our Gracious

cious King *Charles*, to the Ruine of the Crown, We now begin to know; If at leaſt *Knowledge* may properly be ſaid to be wrought by *Senſe*; For, if ſo, our feeling was enough to Teach us. Yet what wanted in *This*, may be ſupplied by the dayly complaints we are forced to hear, not only from *Englamd*, but *Ireland* alſo; where yet perhaps they have more parts to act than one. But *he that ſitteth in Heaven laugheth at them, the moſt High hath them in Deriſion.*

CHAP. IX.

How ſuitable ſuch Epiſcopacy *can be to* Monarchy, *is farther conſidered. Whether the Beſt forme of Church Government be* Monarchicall. *Whether other Forms may not well ſtand with* Civil Monarchy. *How* Church *and* State *Government differ and agree.*

I Have ſcarce done with that Grand Principle of Epiſcopall Policy, *No Biſhop, No King.* Yet I muſt now divert you a little from it, or at leaſt lay it aſide a while, till it come in again at due place: which perhaps may be in this next diſpute.

I am

I am now come to the moſt moderate of Epiſcopal men. For, even theſe affirm, That *the abſolute Beſt Church-Government under a Monarchy*, is *Monarchicall.*

By the way, I muſt deſire it may again be remembred, that hitherto I have contended only with our *Lordly Civil Epiſcopacy*, (properly called *Prelacy*) I have not yet diſputed Eccleſiaſtical Epiſcopacy in general, or the Prelacy of one Miniſter before another (though I may touch that alſo before I conclude) ſo that I am not bound to anſwer this Objection; which ſure cannot mean that the Beſt Church Government under *Monarchy* is *Tyrannical*, (as indeed ſuch Lordly Prelacye is even in their own judgements which are moderate) but ſimply *Monarchical*, *ſcilicet in Eccleſiaſticis*: againſt which I have not yet diſputed; though I know this was one of the main Foundations on which That Deſtroyer, that man of ſin began firſt to build.

But I am content to follow them here alſo. Yet I muſt firſt ſift out their meaning, leſt they deceive me with words. Do they mean that *All other* Church Governments are deſtructive to *Monarchy*? or do they mean, *Monarchy* is deſtructive to all other Church Governments but *Monarchical*?

The

The firſt ſenſe is even the ſame with the former Axiome we diſcuſs'd, *No Biſhop, No King*; except perhaps they grant, that every *Monarch* is a *King*, but every *King* is not an abſolute *Monarch*.

But take *Monarchy* in what ſenſe you pleaſe: why cannot it ſtand with any kind of Church Government? doth the ſupreme Civil power receive any *eſſential* part of it from *Church Monarchy?* Is not Monarchy compleat even there where is no Church?

I am by no means of their judgements who ſay, *None that are without the pale of the Church have right to any Thing here below.* A Tenet almoſt neceſſary to thoſe that uſe to excommunicate Princes *ad placitum*, and then ſtir up forraign Enemies, or Subjects themſelves to diſpoſſeſſe ſuch Princes; but to other States of very dangerous conſequence.

I clearly conceive an Heathen Emperour may be as lawful a *Monarch* as any Chriſtian Prince; And I doubt not but His Subjects owe as exact obedience to him (if his Civil Title be juſt) as we juſtly pay to our Kings and Governours.

To ſay then that *Monarchy* cannot ſtand without Monarchical Diſcipline in the Church, is to weaken (if not to break)

the nerves and ligaments of Supreme power: nay, to ſay that ſuch a Government will beſt ſuit with *Monarchy*, is to vail the luſtre and Majeſty of Monarchy, which like an healthful Stomach, can eaſily aſſimulate all things to it ſelf, but is not changed by any.

If they would but ſpeak their own Thoughts, They would turn the Propoſition thus, *Church-Monarchy cannot ſtand without Civil.* Here the *Myſtery* is unmaſked. It is true, *This Diſcipline* cannot ſtand, but where Princes will uphold it. For that which hath no footing in *Scripture* muſt lean upon *Humane Right*; and thus it diſcovereth its own weakneſſe. *Divine Inſtitution* is able to bottom it ſelf upon it ſelf, but *Humane* is like the weak *Vine*, or *Hop*, which without a pole, muſt creep, and ſo rot upon the earth. Yea, ſome inventions of men (ſpecially in matters of Religion) are like the weak fruitleſſe Ivy, that muſt be propt up by ſome *Elme*, or mighty *Oake*, and yet moſt unnaturally deſtroyeth That prop which holdeth it up. And of this kind is that *Humane* (or rather Demonical) *Epiſcopacy*, of which we have treated all this time.

Our Biſhops foreſeeing this, (for they are wiſe in their generation) thought beſt

to

to invert the propoſition; and inſtead of this, That *Church Monarchy cannot ſtand without Civil*, They affirm *Civil Monarchy* cannot ſtand without that of the *Church*. Thus they delude Silly people.

But to come a little nearer to their Beſt meaning, (who ſtand ſo much for *Church Monarchy*) I would gladly be ſhewed by Reaſon, what there is in Church government why it may not derive it ſelf into ſeveral Corporations, where either more or fewer may bear the ſway; ſtill ſubſcribing to thoſe things which are left by Chriſt to the Civil government, or Monarchical power. We ſee hundreds of Corporations are thus managed: and what there is *in formali ratione* of Church government, (eſſential to Church government) that will not endure This; *Mihi non liquet*; Truely I doe not yet know, I cannot yet imagine.

We ſee ever ſince the reformation of *Luther* and *Calvin*, the Churches of Chriſt have had another Diſcipline than ours; under Elective and Succeſſive, under Proteſtant and Catholick Princes, as will appear clearly in *Poland*, *Denmarke*, in *Scotland*, and the *Palatinate*, in *France*, and *Germany*. I do from my heart agree that *Civil* Governors are *Cuſtodes utriuſque*

Tabulæ, the Preſervers of both the Tables: but what the Civil Magiſtrate hath to do in Church matters, till the Church hath done her utmoſt, I could yet never learn.

The Government of Chriſt is ſpiritual; and he will have his work wrought in a ſweet way; by the power of the Spirit, not by force.

If I err in this, I ſhall upon better reaſon recant; In the interim, hoping that the clearneſſe of my thoughts ſhall with the candid Reader receive gentle Interpretation, I ſhall freely declare my opinion in this point.

Chriſt (as I ſhall more fully prove hereafter) hath cleerly unfolded to us the two main things of Church affairs.

1. The Doctrine.
2. The Diſcipline of his Church.

Who will come in this caſe to add or diminiſh any thing?

I appeal to any Ingenuous Reader, of what Religion ſoever he be; (yea, of what ſect in any Religion) Whether any power ought to force a Church in matter of *Doctrine*.

I conceive, what *is* True Doctrine the Scripture muſt judge, and none but the Scripture: but what a Church will take for True Doctrine, lies only in that Church.

Will

Will *Rome* admit us to expound to them this place, *Hoc eſt corpus meum?* ſhall we admit *Rome*'s expoſition? Will *either* of us admit force?

There is certainly but one truth: but what ſhall be taken by the Church for truth, the Church muſt judge.

If you deſcend to Diſcipline, will not the caſe cleerly be the ſame?

In Diſcipline conſider three things.

1. Admiſſion of Members.
2. Excommunication.
3. Officers to execute theſe, and other Ordinances.

Whether you will Baptize Children, and ſo by adminiſtring to them the Sacrament of Initiation, admit them members of the Church?

Whether you will admit all for Church members that barely profeſſe, though they be open Drunkards, and very ignorant perſons.

Whether you will have *Paſtors*, *Teachers*, and *Elders*, as your ſuperiors in this work, or *Biſhops*, *Arch-Biſhops*, *Primates*, &c. who ſhall judge but the Church?

So long as the *Church* in her *Church* Tenets intermedleth not with *State* matters under the notion of Religion, I ſuppoſe the *Civil* power is not to interpoſe.

It is moſt true, if the *Church* will broach (with the *Anabaptiſts*) that they will have no *Governours*, nor Goverment: This is a point not of Divinity, but Policie; and here the Scepter muſt ſet a rule. Or with the *Adamites* (if there be any ſuch) allow Communion of Wives: This takes away property, the Sword muſt divide this quarrell. Or with the Papiſts, that it is lawful to *kill Kings*: That faith is not to be kept with *Hereticks*: I conceive in all theſe, (and caſes of the like nature) the deciſion lyeth in the *Magiſtrate*; for theſe tenets overthrow either Civil Government, or civil Converſe; the Church muſt not go out of her bounds.

But if the queſtion be, how you will expound ſuch a Scripture: what Geſture you will uſe in ſuch an Ordinance: what man is fit to be excommunicated? what deſerveth excommunication? what is Idolatry? what is wil-worſhip? what ſuperſtition? what is the puniſhment of thoſe crimes? who ſhall judge but the Church?

The Prince hath granted to ſuch a Body by Charter, ſuch priviledges, ſuch offices, who can interpoſe but the power inſtituting? Chriſt hath given us a platform of Church Government, with the offices,

offices, and Officers; who may here intermeddle, but Chriſt himſelf?

It is moſt true, when the Church findeth any refractary, and thereupon doth excommunicate him, he fals into the hands of the Civil Magiſtrate, if he continue pertinacious, and not before.

When Parliaments do conſider matters of Religion, they do it to deliver the *Church* from ſome who would impoſe upon her; who would take the keyes from her, that by the help of theſe keys, they may wreſt the *Scepter* out of the hand of *Soveraignty*, which God forbid.

And whilſt *Parliaments* labour thus for the *Church*, dealing no further in the affairs of the Church, than by *Scripture* they may, certainly they do well; but if they once exceed their bounds, the iſſue will be *Confuſion* inſtead of *Reformation*.

Church and *State* Government differ as much as the *Sexes*, yet as there may between theſe be an happy union: (Both keeping their bounds whilſt the Husband hath the Supremacy;) ſo may there be between the *Church* and *State* a ſweet harmony. The State having committed to it the cuſtody of the ten Commandements, and yet the Church preſerving to herſelf her Rights.

If the Church ſwallow up the State, as it is in Popery, and Epiſcopacy, the iſſue will be ſlaviſh groſſe ſuperſtition, and ſtockiſh Idolatry. If the State over-top the Church, there will be Ignorance and Atheiſm: but give to God that which is Gods, and to *Cæſar* that which is *Cæſars*; and both Church and State will fare the better.

Thus under favour, both by Reaſon and Preſident it is clear, That any *Church policy* beſides *Epiſcopacy*, (though only one by right ought) may ſtand with *Monarchy*.

CHAP. X.

Who it is that oppoſeth and exalteth himſelfe above all that is called God. *Who is properly a* Papiſt: *and what is* Popery: *Why the* Pope *is moſt properly* Antichriſt: *How ſuch* Epiſcopacy *differs or agrees with* Popery.

WHen I ſay, *Any Church government may ſtand with Monarchy*, or other *State-policy*, I deſire to be underſtood of *any Church government well regulated*: which as I cannot conceive of our *Epiſcopacy*, ſo I muſt again publickly proteſt, that I verily believe This kinde of *Epiſcopacy*

pacy is deſtructive, not only to good Monarchy, but all other State-Policy whatſoever.

I mean not now to run over ſo much as the heads of my former diſcourſe: Every particle of which is to repreſent how incongruous, & incompatible to true Policy of State, our Biſhops Place, Calling, and Office is, as now it ſtands eſtabliſht in this Kingdome.

If any man ſhall yet diſſent from me in this Cauſe, I ſhall now only intreat him to view one place of Scripture, which yet perhaps at firſt glance may ſeem to make but little for my purpoſe: but it is an old Maxime among Interpreters, *Non eſt hærendum in Cortice*, we muſt not reſt in the Letter. Let us therefore a little examine the Text, and if I be not in the Right, I will gladly learn of any that can better inform me.

The place I mean, is that which of old in the Primitive Church was wont to be more peruſed and examined, than I think it is now, or hath been of late: and I cannot much wonder, ſith I ſee all men view the Sea, and well conſider it at diſtance from the top of a Cliff or Rock; but when they are once faln into it, they ſhut their eyes, wink, and care to

ſee

ſee as little as may be of it, while they have ſo much round about them.

I muſt not detain you too long without, leſt you think my porch longer, and bigger than my houſe. It is that of the Apoſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, *Ep. 2. ch. 2. v. 3, 4.* ſpecially thoſe words: *Who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, or is worſhipped.*

For the underſtanding of this place, we muſt premiſe This, that it muſt not be taken as ſpoken of *One ſingle Perſon*: but a *Compages* of *many*, either exiſting together, or elſe ſucceeding one another; yet agreeing together in this great Apoſtacy, The main thing here ſpoken of. And in this I have but few Adverſaries: None I think, but ſome few of the Romiſh Faction that maintain the grand Deceiver, Falſe Prophet, or Apoſtate (for ſo I rather call him, than Antichriſt, though I doubt not alſo but he is moſt truely Antichriſt *in Re*) ſhall come onely in the end of the world, and indure but three years and an half, which yet begins to ſound but ill among the Romaniſts themſelves.

In the next place I affirm, This *Man of Sin* (for ſo I muſt ſtile him) is not of the *Laity*, over whom (even over their Princes

Princes and Gods) he exalteth himſelf; but of the *Clergie*, for he ſitteth in the *Temple of God.*

Being come ſo far (without any reall oppoſition) I now demand, Who This *Man* (*Compages* or *Syſteme* of *Men*) is, or can be? The *Pope*, I ſuppoſe will be anſwered by moſt of our Church. And I yield it ſo; believing him to be principally intended here. But if I can prove that *Popery* properly taken, is the ſame *in Re*, with *Our Epiſcopacy*; or at leaſt that *This* is but a Peice and Part of That *Myſtery* of *Iniquity*, then I hope it will be granted, that ſuch *Epiſcopacy* is alſo here intended: and *per conſequens*, that ſuch *Epiſcopacy* is altogether againſt true Policie of State, becauſe it oppoſeth and exalteth it ſelf above all that is called God, &c.

This therefore is now my Task, to prove that *Our Epiſcopacy* is the ſame really with *Popery*, taken *properly.*

Let us firſt then ſee what *Popery properly* may ſignifie: for, for ought I yet ſee, the world is ſcarce agreed in this particular. I cannot conceive that All Errors or Hereſies held by ſome (nay all) *Papiſts*, may in proper ſpeaking be called *Popery.* Moſt (I hope all) of the Papiſts *agree* with us

in

in many Truths, and all is not *Hereſie* in which they *Differ:* and yet All *hereſie* in them, not proper *Popery*. No, not every Error or Hereſie in the *Pope* himſelf can *proprie loquendo* be ſaid to be *Popery*. There are many Things the Papiſts hold in common with many, If I may not ſay, All *Hereticks:* yet none ever properly called All *Hereticks* by the compendious name of *Papiſts*. Many points are not yet ſo fully determined amongſt themſelves, but that ſome of them *affirm*, and others *deny* of the ſame ſubject. All of them will not agree about Original ſin, Free will, Merit, &c. In this laſt (which yet is one of the moſt fundamentall points of controverſie now between us) I ſee many of them comming ſo neer the Truth, that one muſt have a quick ſharp eye to ſee where they come ſhort, for many of them yield, Our works do not properly *merit* as Ours, but as *Tincta ſanguine Chriſti*, as dyed in the blood of Chriſt; yea, and ſome are not rigid in preſſing the phraſe *Merit*, in its proper ſenſe, ſo that perhaps their moſt refined opinion in this, may be more dangerous in the conſequence, than ſubſtance or form of it.

Nay, before the Council of *Trent*, (before which yet *Popery* had been long in the

the world) moſt of their Tenets were ſo much undetermined, that ſcarce any of them knew what he was to hold and believe; yet he was a Papiſt then, and is ſo ſtil, and yet to this day I think there is ſcarce one Doctrinal point in which they all agree.

We muſt then conſider what that is which Denominates a *Papiſt*, and may properly be called *Popery*. It muſt ſure be ſomewhat *Eſſential* (as I may ſpeak) to that Church, ſo that without this it could not be called a *Popiſh* Church.

That is doubtleſſe ſuch and ſuch *Dependence on the Pope*: This is in the Popes ſubjects truly *Popery*; and this Dependence on him, is perhaps expreſſed by receiving his *Name* or *Character* in the Apocalyps. In the *Pope* himſelf, it is not this or that errour, this or that Hereſie, but ſuch an Independence, ſuch a Lordſhip, ſuch a Prelatical Tyranny over civil and Church eſtates, that is κατ' ἐξοχὴν *Popery*. And this is it that is ſo emphatically expreſſed here in this place to the *Theſſalonians*, *He oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, &c.* And the exerciſe of this Popiſh Tyranny is lively limn'd out in *Apoc.* 13. *ver.* 16 & 17. *And he cauſed all, both ſmall and great, rich and poor, free and bond,*

bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their forehead. And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the marke, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

This Tyrannical Prelatical Power and Dominion, which the Pope usurpeth and exerciseth (contrary to Gods word) over Clergy and Laity, Princes and Subjects, in their estates and consciences, is in him, (as in his Clients, *yielding* and *submitting to this Popish Prelacy*) *True Proper Popery.* And this is the Giving, Imprinting, or forcing of a Name, Character or Number on the Popes part, as Receiving this on the part of *Papists*: though I have not now time, at least not opportunity, to discusse how much the Popes *Name*, *Character* and *Number* may differ. I doubt not but all are parts of that Prelatical, usurped power which is truly *Popish*; and received by *Papists*, as Servants and Souldiers of old received their Lords and Commanders *Tessera*, or Character in their hands and foreheads. But God also hath impressed his *Motto* on them all, let them read it and tremble; *Apocal.* 14. 9, 10. *And the third Angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the Beast and his Image, and receive his marke*

in

in his forehead, or in his hand, the ſame ſhall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is powred out without mixture into the cup of his Indignation, and he ſhall be tormented with fire and brimſtone in the preſence of the Holy Angels, and in the preſence of the Lamb.

God hath been pleaſed to parcell out *Church* and *Common-wealth* as ſeveral and diſtinct Governments: yet ſo that Princes ſhould be *Cuſtodes utriuſque Tabulæ*, as was ſaid before.

God hath been pleaſed to make, appoint, and leave the Miniſters of the Goſpel *Brethren*, and hath permitted none of them a Lordly Prelacy above another.

But now the Pope comes with a wide mouth, and ſwallows down at once, all *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical* power; Challengeth to himſelf, not onely the *Keys*, but the *Sword*; not only Papal Dominion in *Eccleſiaſticis*, but Regal alſo in *Civilibus*. This Uſurpation of His, is properly *Popery*, and this robbeth *Chriſt* of his *Regal Office*.

As every ſin breaks all the Commands, (the whole Law) yet ſome ſins do more properly intrench on ſome particular command: ſo alſo is it in all Hereſies

and

and errors. All ſome way oppoſe the whole Law of Chriſt, and all the three Offices of Chriſt; yet ſome more properly One of theſe Offices, ſome another. As the Doctrine of *Merit*, *de Condigno, & Congruo*, of Condignity, and Congruity, encroacheth on Chriſts Prieſtly Office; the *Alchoran* mainly againſt his *Propheticall*. But *Popery* moſt properly ſtrikes at his Kingly Office & Authority. For it is Chriſts Kingly Office to bind *Kings in Chains*, *and princes in Fetters of Iron*, if they reſiſt him. And he that uſurps this Power and Priviledge, labours to unthrone Chriſt, to ſit above him, and ſo properly *oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, or is worſhiped. This is the Pope, and this is Popery.* Yea, I may add, this is truly, and moſt properly *Antichriſt*; though indeed perhaps not that *Antichriſt* of whom S. *John* ſpeaks in his firſt Epiſtle, Chap. 2. 22. and 4. 3. who, it may be, was *Ebion*, or *Cerinthus*, or ſome other: though perhaps alſo S. *John* might ſpeak that of ſome Lordly Prelacy, which began (though but to dawn, if I may ſo ſpeak of that dark myſtery, beginning to ſhew it ſelfe) even in St. *John*'s daies: for in ſome reſpect we will not ſtand to yield a Biſhops Pedegree might perhaps extend ſo high: for even then Antichriſt was conceived. How-

However I doubt not to affirm the *Pope* is now moſt Really, Truly, and properly the Grand *Antichriſt*. For ſuch is He moſt properly, that encroacheth on *Chriſts Regal office*. This being it, which now (of all the three) is moſt proper to him in his *Glory*: and this he hath received as a moſt glorious Reward (if I may ſo ſpeak) for all his ſufferings in his humane Nature: and this I think the Scripture Language, (*Eſay* 53. 12. *Pſal.* 110. 7. *Phil.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11. 1 *Cor.* 15. 27.) His *Prieſtly* work was for the moſt part accompliſht in his *Death*: His *Prophetical* Office, as it were reſigned over to his Holy *Spirit*; But his Kingly Office is his own propriety, (til the end come) and ſo he that oppoſeth this, is moſt truely *Antichriſt*. This is the *Pope*, and this is *Popery*.

Now on the other part, if any man pleaſe to ſurvey *Epiſcopacy* with an impartial eye, he ſhall find this kind of *Epiſcopacy*, and *Popery* to be all one *in Re*, for they have the ſame *Riſe*, the ſame *Media* of their progreſſe, and the ſame *End*.

The riſe of Popery, was by overthrowing Chriſts Ordinances, and ſetting up of his own. That this may appear the more diſtinctly, give me leave to ſhew

you the Biſhops boldneſs in the particulars of it.

Chriſts Ordinances in the New Teſtament, are either concerning *Doctrine*, or *Diſcipline*. I confeſſe the *Pope* hath made great aſſaults upon the doctrinal part; but what he hath done in that kind, he hath done many times by gathering up the regorgements of others, and ſo they are not his own: or as an *Heretick*, but not as *Pope*, for the reaſons which I have even now mentioned.

But he hath plaid his part mainly in point of Diſcipline: This moſt properly belonging to Chriſts royall Office, as Doctrine to his prophetical.

In the Diſcipline, there are two things conſiderable.

1. That which concerneth the Officer.
2. That which concerneth the Nature of his Office.

In the caſe of the Officer, you have his *Acceſſe* to his Office, and his *Execution* of the Office. In the firſt *Election* and *Ordination* are conſiderable.

By Gods rule his *Election* is to be *by the people*; his *Ordination from the people* by the hand of the *Presbytery*. By the rule of *Poprry*, a Miniſter is *Ordained* by the *Pope*, and his Subſtitute, and is *elected* by the ſame

same power, and in the same way. And as their School darkens (with a mist of their termes) what they cannot *cleer*: So do these; to cloud their swerving from Christs rule, They raise up new termes, and instead of *Election* have *Presentation*, *Institution*, and *Induction*. The first is done by the *Patron*, the second by the *Bishop*; a way which Christ never knew. It is so well known to all men that *Episcopacy* traces these very paths of *Popes* that I shall not need to say more for this part of their Identity.

In the execution of his Office there are Acts of two sorts: some wherein he hath a *Joynt* power with other; some wherein he is a *sole Agent*: he is sole in Church Preaching, and in Administration of the Sacraments; he is coadjutor to others in Admission of members, in Excommunication.

Under the Papacie, the Minister or Priest hath the power of Preaching, and Administration according to Gods Law (and this only with relation to the Bishop, who in his Church superintends:) But in the other he hath no power at all; it is wholly given up to the Pope, and by him committed to the Bishop. And thus the Pope may truely (while he is *Do-*

minus Dominorum) ſtile himſelf *ſervum ſervorum*: for he impropriates all Offices to himſelf; and in liew of Coadjutors given by God to the Miniſter, the Biſhop hath Officers appointed him by the Pope.

The Coadjutors of the Miniſters by the Word in ſome Caſes were the *People*, in ſome Caſes the *Elders* and *Deacons*, and ſometimes People, Elders and Deacons: but the Pope in lieu of theſe hath inſtituted another generation of helpers; and leſt that true name ſhould reduce true Officers, he hath given them yet another title, as *Apparitor*, *Surrogate*, *Chancellour*, *Officiall*, *Commiſſaries*, *Deans*, *Church-wardens*, *Overſeers* of the poor. In all which *Epiſcopacy* and *Popery* have ſo twin-like a frame, that ſeeing one, you ſee both; *Nec Soſia Soſiæ ſimilior, nec ſimiæ ſimia*; *Soſia* is not more like to *Soſia*, nor an Ape to an Ape: And ſo I leave that point, which concerns the *Officer*.

In the nature of his office it is conſiderable, firſt, What the work of his Office is: ſecondly, From what power: and thirdly, in what manner he doth it.

For the firſt, the ſubject matter of his office is Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, Preaching, Admiſſion of members, Excommu-

communication. In reckoning theſe, the Pope conformeth to Gods Word, and ſo doth *Epiſcopacy*; for if we will err, we muſt ſometimes go right, and then we may tranſgreſſe with leſſe ſuſpition.

But conſider from what power the Miniſter of the Goſpel Acts. He ought not to borrow his Commiſſion from any, but from Chriſt, from Scripture; and he ought to keep cloſe to That: now the Papacy is wholly ſteered by Traditions, Decretals, Councils, Canons, Colledge of Cardinals, and the Pope in the Chair, where he cannot err in matters of Faith. The Pandects of the Civil Law, are too too boyſtrous, and of too great extent for any Civilian to comprehend; and yet that body of their learning is boyled up to ſuch a Degree that it runs over, and no memory is able to attain it, more than to compaſſe perfection in the learning of the *Chinoes*, where the A. B. C. amounts to 10000 letters. Conſtitutions croſſe one another, and almoſt all fight againſt the Goſpel of Chriſt.

Doth not Epiſcopacy (*Si magna licet componere parvis*, If I may compare great things with ſmall) according to its *modicum*, do the ſame? I confeſſe with them the *Scripture* is the rule, but who muſt

expound this Scripture? Synods, Councils, Convocations, Biſhops, Archbiſhops. Some of theſe ſometimes, ſometimes all of them. And though, by their own confeſſion, theſe bind not mens Conſciences, yet they bind them to obedience: which obedience they do preciſely challenge, and when they fail thereof, they do without the leaſt ſcruple of conſcience proceed to Excommunication, fine, Impriſonment, deprivation, and what not? In the mean time it is held a ſin for a Lay man at all to think of theſe ſtudies. The *Prieſts* lips (they ſay) muſt preſerve knowledge: It is a ſad caſe (ſay they) when men with unhallowed hands will touch the *Arke*, and with unſanctified eyes pry into theſe myſteries; and ſo theſe men, making the Scripture a Rule in appearance, do in truth monopolize all to themſelves: This is juſt and flat Popery.

In the laſt place, the *Manner* which God hath preſcribed, is that every thing be done in decency and in order, with what ſingleneſſe and plainneſſe may be: without any addition of mens inventions. The Pope carrieth on his Juriſdiction with pompe and much outward glory; They have Commiſſions, Injunctions, Charters, Seals, Secretaries, Clerks, and a thouſand

ſand other inventions, to grind the face of the poor. *Epiſcopacy* hath its Courts, Summons, Clerks, Seals, with other ceremonies of the like nature.

Chriſts rule is, that Miniſters of equal rank, ſhall all have equall power. Apoſtles indeed were above Evangeliſts, and Evangeliſts above Paſtors and Teachers: but one Apoſtle was not above another, nor one Paſtor did not ſuperintend another. The Pope hath Prieſt, Biſhop, Archbiſhop, Primate, Patriarch, Cardinall, Pope. And Epiſcopacy hath Miniſters (now called Prieſts) Deacons, Biſhops, Archbiſhops, Primates, &c.

The Scripture commandeth preaching in ſeaſon, and out of ſeaſon; but with the Pope, and our Biſhops, all preaching is now out of ſeaſon, I am ſure out of faſhion in themſelves: and cryed down in others, for with them Ignorance is the mother of Devotion.

The Scripture alloweth but two Sacraments, the *Pope* addeth five; and our *Biſhops* are ambiguous: *Two onely* (they ſay) are *generally Neceſſary to Salvation*; which may clearly intimate, that there are *More than two*; though perhaps not abſolutely *Neceſſary* to Salvation; or though neceſſary, yet not *Generally* neceſ-

ſary to all men, in all times, ſtates and conditions whatſoever. And ſo much the Papiſts yield of their five Sacraments, nay, of ſix of their ſeven: For, onely *Baptiſm* (they ſay) is abſolutely and generally neceſſary to ſalvation; The *Euchariſt* even with them, is not neceſſary to Infants, much leſs *Matrimony*, *Orders*, *Confirmation*, *Penance*, *Unction*. In what do our Biſhops then differ from Papiſts in this?

How do they differ in Baptiſm? Both Pope and Biſhops hold it neceſſary, abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation. Yea, the moſt moderate of Both, maintain a *general Baptiſmal Grace*, Equally confer'd to all partakers of that Sacrament. Indeed Our Biſhops do not openly uſe *Salt* and *Spittle*, but yet they retain the *Croſſe*, (perhaps much worſe) and begin to claim ſpirituall alliances, as the Papiſts do.

In the Lords Supper, the Pope *makes* (rather than *finds*) an *Hoſtia*, an *Altar*, a *Prieſt*, and this Prieſt muſt offer for the ſins of the Quick and Dead. Our *Biſhops* muſt have *Prieſts*, *Altars*, *a Sacrifice*, *Corporals*, and what not that Papiſts have? to ſay nothing of their Times and Geſtures, which ſure the Scripture never ſo determined, much leſs excluded any that could not yield to ſuch and ſuch circumſtances, which

which none ever thought could be more than *Indifferent.*

In all Ordinances the Scripture now ſpeaks of no other Holineſſe, than that which is Spiritual, Rational, the Holineſſe of the whole man. The Pope hath found out new Holinets, which he puts on *Places, Times, Veſtments, Bels, Tapers, Water, Wafers, Copes, Baſons, Pots,* and *Cups,* with other Utenſles.

And do not our Biſhops ſo alſo? What means ſuch rigid preſſing of Holy dayes? Bare heads in Churches? Holy Surplices? What meane they elſe by their Holy Chalices? Holy Knives? Holy Patents? Holy Utenſles? all which may be ſo ſanctified by a devout Prieſt, that they may become profitable to the Souls of thoſe that uſe them. How then do our Biſhops differ from Papiſts in adminiſtring Sacraments, Manner of all Ordinances.

And is there any greater Difference In *Admiſſion* of *members,* and *Excommunication?* This laſt being the laſt and greateſt cenſure of the Church, by both Biſhops and Pope, is made not only moſt common (as the humor moves them) but alſo moſt ridiculous; being the uſual appendix of one groat ſhort in our Reckonings with our Lord Biſhops regiſter, Proctor or Apparitor.

I would not be miſtaken here; I bring not in theſe things of Doctrine, or Diſcipline, as if by agreeing in one, or many of theſe, I might convince Biſhops and Papiſts (or the Pope) were all one. The main thing I drive at in all this, is the Original Fountain from whence all theſe ſpring, and all the banks that keep in theſe Rivulets; That vertue and power which moves and actuates all theſe in their proper Channels: And this is *Papal.*

For, what ever the Pope doth of his own head, by his own power, Dictating to his Vaſſals, as Head of the Church, This is truly Papal, and ſuch is the power by which they uſurp ſo much over mens perſons, and conſciences, in injoyning and preſſing ſuch or ſuch Doctrine or Diſcipline.

So that a Biſhops wearing a Surplice, Cope, Mitre: uſing the Croſſe, Bowing to the Altar, and many ſuch Things (though they may be Errors, yet All theſe, or One of theſe) makes him not a Pope, a Popeling, or properly Antichriſtian: But receiving theſe from the Popes Dictates, doing them becauſe he commands, acknowledging his power in commanding; This makes a *Papiſt*: and commanding them, preſſing them on Others,

in

in ſuch Deſpoticall power, makes a true *Pope, a Reall Antichriſt.*

Nor may our Biſhops Evade by This (which I eaſily ſee will be anſwered) that though indeed they do theſe things, and command theſe things; yet they neither do them from the *Popes Command*, nor Command them in the *Popes power.*

Though I ſhould grant this, which yet many wiſe men will nor grant, (for, our Biſhops firſt power came from the Pope, and of late alſo we have found letters, advice, commands, Dictates from the *Pope*, to ſome of our Biſhops; and that in Matters of greateſt conſequence, both for Church and State;) But grant all they ſay, yet they may be Antichriſtian, and ſo ſuch in *Re*, as the *Pope* is; though not literally *Romaniſts*, except they do, or command in the power of *Rome.*

This I ſhall be bold to affirm and maintain, till I ſee better reaſon, that He, (whoever he be) that commands the leaſt tittle of Doctrine, or Diſcipline, meerly *Ex Imperio voluntatis*, in his own power, and Authority; without Licenſe or Warrant from Scripture, or Right Reaſon, (where the Scripture hath been ſilent) though the thing he ſo commands ſhould happen to be good in it ſelf: Yet He in

his

his ſo commanding, is not only *Tyrannicall*, but *Antichriſtian*, properly *Antichriſtian*; Encroaching on the Royall Office of Chriſt, which is truly High Treaſon againſt God; and moſt properly *Antichriſtianiſme*. I care not whether we call him a *Pope*, *Papiſt*, *Romaniſt*, or any other name; I call him *Antichriſt*: And if you will call *Antichriſt* by the name of *Pope*, I call ſuch an Imperious Commander among us, (though he have no ſhadow of Dependance on *Rome*, or Romiſh Pope) an Engliſh *Pope*, I mean an Engliſh *Antichriſt*.

I need not ſpend much time in ſhewing by what *means* either the Pope, or our Biſhops began, and continued to be ſo Antichriſtian: *Du Pleſſis* and Others have ſav'd me this labour. In a word, they have been theſe. With one hand they have laid pillows under Princes, and all Governours (appointed by God) that ſo they might fall ſoftly, while they thruſt them down with the other (the ſtronger) Hand, Arm and all. When theſe have been ſo ſurely, though gently, layed down aſleep; They have been bold to tread on them, (yet with pluſh ſlippers, leſt they ſhould chance to wake, ſtir, and get up again) and by them, as ſo many

ſtairs

ſtairs or ſteps, mount up themſelves into this Height of Tyranny. Thus have they ſtill *oppoſed, and advanced* themſelves, againſt and above all that is called *God*, or is *worſhipped*. And if with your own thoughts you will pleaſe to go on in the Chapter, you will find ſome other *Media* (as Lying Wonders, and others by which they have aſcended.

I ſhall not need to parallel Popiſh and Epiſcopal *Media* to their Height. All the world ſees them now, For they were not done in a Corner.

What means their crying up an unjuſt and illimited power in Princes? Is not This their bleating out of an illegal unwarranted Prerogative (with which all our pulpits have rung of late) intended to tickle Princes til they be lull'd aſleep? or to ſow pillowes under them, till They themſelves can thruſt them down; not only from that Tyranny which Biſhops would perſwade them to uſurp; but alſo from their wholſom and lawful prerogative.

What meaneth their Buzzing in Princes Ears, that Kings cannot ſtand without ſuch Biſhops? That if they ſhould be put down, the Church, and State too, muſt needs be Ruined? to this purpoſe they

They cry Blood, Blood; They can never fall without Blood: ſo ſome of them have vaunted. But let them remember what Chriſt ſaid to One (to whom they ſo much pretend) *He that ſmiteth with the Sword, ſhall periſh by the Sword.* They know alſo whoſe Coat was ſent home to their Holy Father, with this Inſcription (written with his own blood) *Judge Holy Father whether This be Thy Sons Coat or not.*

I have not forgotten how they have dealt with the People, Miniſtry, Gentry, Nobility, All ſorts of men: For they have many ſtairs to ſtep up by, to ſuch an height! but Princes are their higheſt ſteps their firſt aim.

That which they have moſt ſounded in the Peoples Ears, is the Church, the Church, the Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord! by This, as by a ſtalking horſe, they have come much neerer than elſe they could. But now their Vizard begins to fall off; and men begin to ſee the true power of the True Church; and the Tyranny of that Antichriſtian Mock-Church; which under the Maſk of *Indifference*, hath brought in moſt abominable Superſtitions, and moſt intolerable Slavery on the Perſons, Liberties,

berties, Bodies, and *Souls of Men.* For they have preſſed Conſciences, even unto Gaſping: yea, and would not be ſatisfyed, though they daily heard the ſighs and groans of thoſe bleeding hearts which themſelves had ſtab'd with the poyſoned Sword of *Church-Indifference.*

Indeed they have uſed Both hands, and have ſtricken with Both. What the *Keyes* could not break, the *Sword* hath cut. And it had been much more tolerable, If this Sword had pierced no farther than the Ears of men; with which they have yet been much more buſie than he was, whom they brag to have been their firſt Predeceſſor. Yet me thinks it was a ſad Omen that this Sword ſhould cut off the Ear of *Malchus*, which ſignifies (they ſay) a *King*, or *Kingly Authority*. At this they ſtrike indeed, through the Eares, and Hearts of ſo many Loyall Subjects.

We need not ſeek their End in all this. It cannot be doubted, but by all theſe *Means* they aim at one End, (which is alſo the Popes) to pull down all Other Power, and ſet up their own. Thus, Thus they *Oppoſe* and *Exalt* themſelves above *All* that is called *God*, or is *Worſhipped*; as is more fully repreſented in another place of this diſcourſe.

Now

Now let any man living ſpeak: Are Theſe Biſhops, theſe uſurping Prelates to be ſuffered in a Church or State, where there is any reſpect to Right, Church Government, or true State-policy? Since it is evident they are truly *Papal*, moſt properly *Antichriſtian*; and as Antichriſt, muſt Oppoſe and Exalt themſelves above all that is worſhipped, or called God: Which is moſt true *Popery*, (as hath been demonſtrated) And as Popery, Deſtructive to all Church and State-policy.

Doubtleſſe ſome ſuch Apprehenſions as this wrought in their breſts, who, being offered, have refuſed Biſhopricks; and being poſſeſſed, could not reſt till they had diſ-inveſted themſelves again.

Hiſtories are full of Foreign and Domeſtick Examples of this Subject. Such was *Niceph. Blemmides* choſen Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, *Weringbaldius* choſen Biſhop of *Triers*, *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Adiana*, *Aminonius* cut off his Ear, (being Biſhop) that ſo he might be uncapable of that Function. *Eugenius* (the Philoſopher) left his Miniſtery rather than he would be a Biſhop. *Baſſianes*, an elected Biſhop, was by *Mennon* whipped before the Altar (three hours together) becauſe he would not be made a Biſhop. *Adrian* (with us) refuſed the Archbiſhoprick

bishopbrick of *Canterbury*, being pressed thereunto. Two or Three Popes might come into this Catalogue; *Clement* the first was one: *Et quis fuit Alter?* Shall I name *Marcellus?* He neither refused nor resigned the *Papacy*; yet solemnly professed *He saw not how those that possessed such high places could be saved.*

O but had these piously considered, what good they might have done in such high places, or duly remembred their Own, or their friends advancement, they could never have done this: But *Ignoti nulla cupido*, Men desire not what they are ignorant of.

For answer to this Objection, I shall give you some instances of those who have resigned up their Bishopricks after they had held them long enough for a full Tryal. Yea, perhaps there be more of This kind than of the other, though the Proverb be, *Egrius Ejicitur quam non admittitur Hospes*, It is harder to throw out a man, than at first to keep him out.

Of these were *Ulbranius* Bishop of *Shetune*, *Arnulphus* Bishop of *Ments*, *Addo* Bishop of *Lions*, *Vicerbus* Bishop of *Ratisbone*, *Henger* Bishop of *Ments*, *Michael* Bishop of *Ephesus*, with many more.

Amongſt our own was *Edmund Boniface*, and *Robert Kalwarby*, (Both Arch-Biſhops of *Canterbury*) *Will. Beavoſe* and *William de Sancta Maria* (Biſhops of *London*.) One of *Lincoln*, and two of *Coventry*. I may add *Miles Coverdale*, who being deprived in Queen *Marys* days would not be re-inveſted in Queen *Elizabeths*, but taught a School. here is one Pope *Cornelius*: And *Gregory* the Great muſt not be forgotten; who ſaid, *He that affects the Primacy of the whole Church muſt be Antichriſt, or his Predeceſſor.*

If ſome few *Walloons*, or men of *Geneva* ſhould declaim againſt *Epiſcopacy*, They would prevail but little, becauſe it would be ſaid of them perhaps (as of that great diſturber of the Church of old) *Inſaniunt, quia non ſunt Epiſcopi*, They rage becauſe themſelves are not Biſhops: But now *Ex ore tuo judicaberis*, Your own mouths ſhall condemn you. Biſhops contend with Biſhops: not with Words, but Deeds. I beſeech you conſider that Fleſh and Blood is not wont to refuſe, or part with ſuch great Advantages: Sure we may conclude there is ſomewhat that ſtings within, *Latet Anguis in Herba*, There is a Snake under the green Graſſe. Theſe Good men, doubtleſſe found a ſting, and they would not kick againſt Prickes.

When

When Saint *Paul* (a Great *Philosopher*) bids us beware lest we be entangled with *Philosophy*. When *Solomon* (who had tasted all the dainty Cates Nature could provide or dresse) cries out, *All is Vanity, All is Vanity*: When Bishops themselves (who have fully enjoyed all the sweetnesse a Bishops Honour can afford) shall pause and cry, It is Enough, It is Enough, *Non iterum bibam Venenum*, I will drink poyson no more, (as once *Diocletian*, of his *Empire*) Sure there must be something worth reflecting on; a fair warning for our Present or Future Bishops.

O you Judges of the Earth, why will you not be wise? O you Senators (for such our Bishops are) why will you not learn Wisedom? God forbid that of You should be said (what the Spirit speaketh of some) *Why should they be smitten, They rebell more and more? Why should they be reproved, They will stil do foolishly?*

Yet but for a little while; For I am confident yet, within *few years*, if not *Months*, if not *Days*, the God of Peace and Truth will deliver his Church of this heavy yoke, from which (with the *Letany* give me leave to conclude) Good Lord deliver us.

SECTION II.

Conſidereth how Conſonant ſuch Epiſcopacy is either to ſound *Antiquity* or *Scripture*.

CHAP. I.

Some Antiquities produced by a late moſt learned and Reverend Patron of Epiſcopacy, *are diſcuſſed.*

HAving clearly proved how uncompatible *Our Epiſcopacy* is to Civil Government in *State-policy*; let us now conſider whether it may ſhelter it ſelf under the myſterious Covert of *Antiquity*.

I could heartily wiſh, that in matters which receive their being from Scripture, ſo immediately as Church Diſcipline doth, we might make the Scripture (which is a ſufficient Rule) our ſole Guide, our ſole Moderator. But as Heretieks in the day of Judge-

Judgement ſhall cry to the Mountains to cover them; ſo Hereſies now alſo fly to the craggy rockes of remoteſt times: and in ſuch dark corners hope to ſhelter themſelves.

Thither alſo we will follow them, *Quo fata trahunt*, whether their deſtiny drives them, we will advance. Not doubting but to unkennel thoſe little Foxes: hoping even with *Goliah*'s ſword to lay *Goliah* in the duſt, and bring the five uncircumciſed Princes of the *Canaanites* to their juſt cenſure before the King or Captains of the *Iſraelites*.

There is a moſt Reverend man, famous for learning, (eſpecially for that learning which is not open to every eye) hath taken upon him the defence of this Cauſe: I ſhall therefore in few words preſent to him my thoughts upon thoſe his Determinations; Concluding with *Philip* of *Macedon*, that If I can but win the *Chiefe City*, the whole Country is gained: Then I ſhall ſee whether Thoſe Things which are preſſed by others, be not altogether inaffectual to determine the point which they diſpute. And ſo I ſhall leave the deciſion of this to the judgement and opinion of the learned.

Before I conſider that Treatiſe in the parts of it, give me leave to ſay that which is moſt true, and I hope will ſatifie all men. If every word of that his book were true; yet it is little to the point: For the Queſtion is not, Whether there have been Biſhops ever ſince Chriſts time, but, Whether theſe have had power over their brethren: or, Whether one Biſhop hath had Juriſdiction over another. And this Queſtion is double.

Firſt, Whether they have had any ſuperintendence one above another.

Secondly, Whether this hath been mixt with that Lordlineſſe which now is uſed: forcing obedience by the edge of the Sword, where the Keys can give no entrance: And of this, in the whole book there is not the leaſt hint, *Ne gry quidem.* Though this alſo were not enough for our queſtion; which is not only of their Lordly power in *Eccleſiaſticis*, but alſo in *Civilibus.*

In the firſt Query, we ſhall quickly joyn iſſue; agreeing with our Antagoniſts that there have been Biſhops (*viz.* Miniſters of the Goſpel) who have had a Scripture power in matter of Government, over particular flocks: but the other we do abſolutely and confidently deny.

Firſt,

Firſt, he endeavoureth to prove the ſucceſſion of ſeven and twenty Biſhops, in the ſeat of *Timothy*: and this he eſſayeth by one ſingle (not to ſay ſimple) witneſſe, a certain man named *Leontius*; whoſe writings have not delivered him famous to us for learning, nor his exemplary holineſſe (mentioned by others) famous for piety.

Truly, a man of greater authority than he, (as *Papias*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarpus*, who, almoſt all, knew the Apoſtles) ſhall not be of credit ſufficient to ſway my faith in this point: Not but that they were moſt worthy men; but becauſe all Antiquity hath paſſed the refining pot of the *Index expurgatorius*, I ſhall conſider well, before I ſubſcribe. And ſhall I then give credit to an unknown Author, in theſe things that were acted almoſt five hundred years before his birth? Let the world judge whether it be equall.

Neither is this Author quoted from witneſſe of his own, but out of a Council. Now how Councils have been abuſed, thoſe who have ever had place, or note in great Aſſemblies, can too well tell: where there is almoſt no *Order* drawn up, but after a ſerious review, reducing the miſtakes of the Clerks to the ſenſe of thoſe

who did frame the *Order*, which might elſe have come forth diſorderly.

By what I have already ſaid, That other teſtimony brought from a fatherleſſe Treatiſe of *Tymothy*'s Martyrdome, cited only by *Photius* (a learned man, who lived ſeven or eight Centuries after Chriſt) will be of no weight: for *Photius* doth but ſay he read it. Hear-ſay in matter of judicature is no good teſtimony: and reports in matter of opinion, at the ſecond hand are good to amuſe thoſe who deifie venerable Antiquity; but will never edifie thoſe who deſire to bottom their reſolutions upon ſound Reaſon.

The teſtimonies of *Felix*, *John* of *Antioch*, and *Theodore*, are not of age ſufficient to be regiſtred among the Ancients, or to be valued becauſe they are old. I confeſſe, I ſet a greater value upon *Ignatius* and *Irenæus*, who affirm, *Polycarpus* was made Biſhop of *Smyrna*, by St. *John*; but this muſt not be of undeniable authority.

For of *Ignatius* I ſhall affirm this, that All thoſe who are any whit learned in Antiquity, know that five of his Epiſtles are ſpurious; and how unmingled thoſe are which we allow to be his, we do not know, who look upon Antiquity at ſuch a di-

a distance. But allow it to be true, that *Onesimus* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, *Polycarpus* Bishop of *Smyrna*, *&c.* This may be true, but evinceth in no measure the Question in dispute: Which is not of a Bishop in generall, but such a Bishop.

The Authority of *Tertullian* also, is of the same credit: He tells us that *Polycarpus* was placed by Saint *John* at *Smyrna*; and at *Rome*, *Clement* by Saint *Peter*. This no body will dispute (though I am not bound to believe it.) But where is the stress of this Argument?

In the last place, that of *Clement Alexandrinus* is as much questioned as all the rest. But allow it to be true, that *John* did appoint Bishops, they have gained nothing; for I shall allow that Christ also hath instituted Bishops, and that Bishops are *Jure divino*; yea, I will allow that they are to feed *Christs* flock, to rule *Christs* inheritance, in *Christs* sense: but I shall never allow of these Bishops, which are now the subject of our dispute.

There are *Three sorts* of Bishops, as *Beza* saith: There are of *Gods Institution*, and they are those who have a power over their proper flock, and with the rest of the Church, and no other. There are also of

Mans

Mans Inſtitution; and this ever overflow-eth into the Neighbour Pariſh. And laſtly, there is a *Demonical Biſhop*; and this is he who challengeth the Sword as well as the Keys.

This laſt may well be ſtiled *Demonical*; for ſure God never erected this Order; nor man in his right ſenſes: Where it will then fix, is cleer enough. Even on him whoſe dark myſteries, moſt of theſe men have been very well acquainted with.

The long Robe and the Sword do not well agree. To ſee a Lawyer tyed to his Sword til he put off his Gown, is not ſo comely; but to ſee a pair of Lawn ſleeves to ſtifle a Scepter, if it were but on a ſtage, I would cry out, *Spectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis*, Can you ſee it, and not burſt out into laughter?

CHAP. II.

Our Biſhops Election, Delegation, *&c. examined by* Antiquity.

THus having run through that little Treatiſe, (yet with ſome wonder, that a perſon of his profeſſion, piety, and known learning ſhould do that, which might

might in any ſenſe ſeem to impoſe on thoſe whom he loveth) I proceed to ſome other things, which I find produced from Antiquity, by the greateſt Patrons of that kind of *Epiſcopacy* which we now oppoſe.

Yet by the way, I muſt note here alſo, That either none ſeem to ſtate the Queſtion (between us) right; or elſe all ſeem to diſert it.

Our Queſtion (as I have often ſaid) is not of the name of *Biſhop*, or his power in *Eccleſiaſticals* onely; but alſo, and mainly of his *Civil* power, and *Temporals*. Which all the Patrons of *Epiſcopacy* ſeem to ſhun, as a dangerous Rock; and hovering aloof off, go about to prove by Antiquity, that Biſhops had this *Name*, and ſome power even in the Primitive Church; which (though I think none can force me to believe, yet) I diſpute not; But demand whether any Biſhops had *ſuch* power in *Eccleſiaſticis & Civilibus*, as ours now have in *England*.

Yet, becauſe they inſiſt ſo much on Antiquity, for *Eccleſiaſtical Epiſcopacy*, I will be content to follow them there alſo; believing we ſhall find no one foot-ſtep (in true Antiquity) of ſuch a Biſhop as we now have eſtabliſhed in *England*, though

though we ſhould ſtrip him of all Civil power, and conſider him only *in Eccleſiaſticis.*

Shall I begin with his *Election?* which indeed is ſomewhat higher than they uſe (perhaps dare) to begin. I can produce many Antiquities to prove the *Election* of all *Church Officers* was in the People; yea, and that for divers Ages after the Apoſtles; who indeed at firſt appointed theſe themſelves: and good reaſon why, when there were no People to chooſe their *Officers*, till converted by the Apoſtles; who afterward left *This* power to the *Whole Church*, rightly conſtituted. And this continued in the *Church* for divers Ages; as appears by *Conſtantines* Epiſtle to the Church of *Nice*: *Athanatius* alſo *ad Orthodoxos*; and Saint *Cyprians* ſixth Epiſtle; with many inſtances more, which might be, and daily are produced.

It is true, that after the Apoſtles, and purer times of the Church were gone, the Clergy began to lord it over the people, and to bereave them of their due priviledge; yea, oft times agreed among themſelves to chooſe one Superintendent (as we may call him) whom they called Father, and Biſhop; and in this perhaps they did not amiſſe, if this Biſhops power reſted only

only on the Clergy; and never reached to the people; who else sure by all reason should have had a vote in chooſing any Officer, much more such a great Commander.

But let all the Patrons of Episcopacy produce me one found Antiquity for such Election as is now in use with us. Let them from undoubted Antiquity for three hundred years after Christ, (nay, much more, for I easily see their evasion) let them, I say, shew me but one Instance of our *Conge d' eslire*: It is the thing I speak of, not the Word.

Let them shew me (except in the dark times of Popery) power given to ten or twelve Men (except all the Clergy explicitely consented) to choose such a Bishop. And yet this is not half that which lies in our Elections; which indeed are not at all made, by so much, as the Chapiter of any Cathedral; but received onely by those who dare not refuse it: but of this I spake before in the first Section.

I am content to passe their Election, (which I perceive none of them care much to examine) and come to the Execution of their Office. In which I might instance in two or three main points; as sole Ordination, sole Jurisdiction, Delegation, &c.

I meet with none that take upon them to defend this laſt; which as a great Stateſman obſerved many years ſince, was a thing, at firſt view, moſt monſtrous and unreaſonable. For, will any man living think it reaſonable my Lord Keeper ſhould *ad placitum* delegate whom he will to keep the Seal, and judge in Chancery, without conſent of His Majeſty and the State, that entruſteth him with this great Office? Yet *Theſe Men* hold it fit to entruſt a *Vicar-General*, *Chancellors*, *Officials*, *Surrogates*, (and yet under-*Officers*) to keep the Seal, yea, weild the Scepter of Chriſt, and all the *Church*, which yet they ſay is entruſted with them. But with whom have they left the Sheep in the Wilderneſſe? Were there nothing elſe but this, I cannot but hold our *Epiſcopacy* an intollerable *Tyranny*; ſeeing a Biſhops Dog (I am not much amiſſe) lording it over the People, Miniſters, Gentry, Nobility, All: while his Maſter is perhaps Revelling, Dicing, or doing worſe; for worſe they do.

Nor is this any way to be helped, while to one Lord Biſhop is granted ſo vaſt a Territory; which yet he commandeth as abſolutely under that moſt ſignificant term of *Dioceſan*, *Primate*, or *Metropolitan*, as any Temporal Prince can do, by the name

name of Earl, Duke, King, Emperor, or any other.

I oft remember the dry Oxe-hide, that was brought to repreſent *Alexanders* great Dominions: But I ſee them ſo far from ſtanding on the middle, (to keep down all) that indeed they oft touch it not at all; but are acting the Lord Temporal (I might ſay more) remote enough from their own *Dioceſſe*.

Which yet of it ſelf is oft ſo large, that no one man living could ſufficiently *Viſit* and *Overſee* it, except he could get the *Pope* to *Tranſubſtantiate* him alſo, and ſo get a *Ubiquitarian* body. To ſupply which he is oft forced to puff up his wide ſleeves, and looke very big: And yet much, yea, moſt of all his Office, muſt be done by *Delegates*; who are oft, yea, uſually the loweſt dregs of baſeſt men.

In good earneſt, I would thank any man, that can ſhew me one good Antiquity to countenance ſuch *Delegation* of an entruſted Office, to Deputies, eſpecially to ſuch Deputies, as themſelves do not, cannot truſt.

Doth any man dare, or can any man think it fit, to *Delegate* the Tuition or Education of a tender Prince, committed to his Charge or Care by his Royal Father?

beſeech you; Is not the flock of Chriſt ſtiled by the Spirit of Chriſt, *An Holy Prieſthood, A Royall People?* Shall it then be fit, or lawful, for any man to tranſmit this truſt to any whomſoever? eſpecially to ſuch a crue of faithleſſe Hirelings? God forbid.

CHAP. III.

Of Ordination, *whether proper onely to* Biſhops: *or equally committed to all* Presbyters: *diſcuſſed by Ancient Authorities.*

I Shall paſſe their *Sole Juriſdiction* alſo, being the Common Theme of all that write of this queſtion; ſpecially when I find ſome of themſelves diſclaim that Epithet of *Sole*: and if they can be content to leave this out, I have leſſe to ſpeak againſt them.

We come to *Ordination*; or to ſpeak as they uſe, (though ſome of them love not to hear of it) *Sole Ordination*. This is the main and Maſter-piece of all *Epiſcopacy*. All things elſe in the Church, they yield equally committed to Presbyters; onely *Impoſition of Hands*, they ſay, is ſolely retained to the Biſhop; ſo *Downham*, *Bilſon*,

Bilson, and of late one of their own, that offers to yield the Cause, for one example of Lawful *Ordination* by Presbyters without a Bishop.

One example? what dare he say, *France*, *Belgium*, no parts of *Germany* hath *Lawful Ordination*, though by sole Presbyters, without Bishops? *Downham* is somewhat more moderate, and yields such Orders Lawfull; but in case of Necessity, or at least, some great Exigency: in which he hath the *Charity* to include the Reformed Churches abroad, though as he saith, *They are of age*, and might speak for themselves.

But they urge us to shew *Antiquity* allowing any such *Ordination* without a Bishop. It hath been shewed, and yet never answered (that I know) that some Councils have intimated enough; *Presbyters* were wont of old to *Ordain* without Bishops.

As that of *Ancyra*, *Can.* 13. *It shall not be lawfull for Chorieпiscopi, or Presbyters to Ordain, without the consent of the Bishop,* ὐν ἐπέρᾳ παροικίᾳ, In another Parish (for so the words are) in *Balsamon*, though some of themselves translate the words very strangely.) Which cleerly intimates, That before this Canon, *Presbyters*

who had not ſtil *Ordination* from three Biſhops, though ſome had ſo,) did uſually *Ordain* without the Biſhops leave, (much more without his preſence;) and that too in other Pariſhes beſides their own; Elſe it is ſtrange the Council ſhould now forbid it, If it had never been done before. Nay, the Canon doth not now abſolutely forbid it, (which is much to be marked) but onely commands, the Biſhops leave ſhould be asked to all ſuch *Ordinations*. But if this *Impoſition of hands* were a *Sole* property of Biſhops, (as now ſome make it) the Biſhop could not give leave, or depute others to do it. For, This, even among themſelves is a received Axiome, *Epiſcopus poteſt delegare ea quæ ſunt Juriſdictionis, non ea quæ ſunt Ordinis*, A Biſhop may delegate thoſe things which concern Juriſdiction, but not thoſe things which concern Order.

Hitherto alſo may be referred all thoſe Canons that require Presbyters to *Lay on their hands* with the Biſhop in *Ordination*: As *Can. 3. Concil. Carth.* about the year 418. and that of *Aken*, 400 years after: Yea, and this was the practice of the Church in St. *Cyprian*'s time, as appears by his 6. and 58. *Epiſt.* So *Jerom* in his Epiſtle to *Rome*, and St. *Ambroſe* among his

his Epistles *Book* 10. Yea, and this is our Law also; which requires *Coadjutors* to Bishops in *Ordination*: Consonant doubtlesse to the most Ancient practice of the Primitive Church, even in the Apostles Times; as appears by that of *Paul* to *Timothy*, on whom were laid the *Hands* of the Presbytery, not of the Presbyterate, or one Presbyter, as learned Master *Thorndick* not only yields, but proves; who yet is no enemy to Bishops.

Neither could I ever find one good Antiquity against *Ordination* by Presbyters, or for *Sole Ordination* by Bishops. I find indeed *Collythus* and some others Unpriested by Councils, because *Ordained* by Presbyters alone; but that Act of the Presbyters was done in faction, against the Bishop, and their fellow brethren. Yea, and in most cases, if not in all, Those *Orders* (so annulled by Councils) were conferred by one Priest alone, and so were indeed as unlawful as if by one Bishop alone.

I might add, that some Great men of good Note, have strongly maintained, all those Councils erred, which so Unpriested those that had been *Ordained* by a Presbyter, or Presbyters, without a Bishop. Amongst these are some of Note

in the Popish Church; It being a common Instance among the School-men, disputing, Whether *Orders* once confer'd could be annul'd; and they all conclude the contrary. Yea, and many of these also strongly prove that Priests may as well *Ordain* as Bishops; and their Reason seems very good; for, say they, Seeing a Priest can Consecrate, and by Consecration Transubstantiate (which is more) why can he not also Administer the Sacrament of *Orders*, which is lesse?

Yea, and some of them dare affirme, Neither Bishop nor Pope can license Priests to give *Ordination*, except the Power of *Ordination* be *de jure*, in Presbyters: For they all yield the Pope himself cannot license one that is not a Priest to Consecrate the *Host*; because none but Priests have that power of Consecration. And a License doth not confer *Orders* without *Imposition of hands*, as they all grant.

For my own part, I ever thought that of *Bucer* most rational, *Deus non simpliciter singularibus Personis, sed* Ecclesiæ *Ordinandi potestatem tradidit*, God hath not committed the Power of Ordination to *particular Persons*, but to the *Church*. For so indeed it seems the work of the whole Church, who are to *Elect*, to testifie also and seal

their

their Election by *Laying on their hands*: And the Presbytery are but the Churches servants in this Act. I could heartily wish it were reduced to this again, which I fully conceive to be most agreeable to right Reason, Scripture, and All Good (untainted) Antiquity. Yet til this be again restored, I much desire the Prelates would leave off some of the *Ceremonies* which I hear they use in it, (though not by Law I think) lest they drive all good men from taking *Orders*.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Name *and* Office *of a* Bishop *in* Scripture. *How little or how much the Scripture makes for, or against Bishops: Divers Texts are discussed.*

I Shall now pass from this kind of Church Antiquity, and pass to the best Antiquity, the infallible Truth of God in Holy *Scripture*. In it I shall shew there is little for, much against Bishops; whether we consider the *Name* or *Office* of a Bishop, as now it is setled.

The *Name* I find but four times in all the New Testament: In two of which the *Name* is so indifferently used, that it maketh nothing towards an issue of this Question. Those are, 1 *Tim.* 3. *v.* 1, 2, 3. and

1 Pet. 2. 25. And what can be gained from hence, truly I see not.

In the other places it maketh against them, as I shall shew more at large by and by.

But the word *Elder* (a true Bishop) is used twenty several times in the New Testament. And you shall find the Apostles honouring this *Name* so much, that one of them stiles himself an *Elder*, but none calls himself a Bishop. Indeed *Judas* is so called; Who (as it were Prophetically) behaved himself so, that his *Arch-Bishoprick* was given to another. I doubt not but the Spirit fore-saw this word would be quickly mounted high enough; so that it brands *Judas* first with this stile.

Of much more Majesty is the Word *Presbyter*, which signifies *Senior*. Under the Law Youth was bound to pay Tribute to Gray hairs. And *Senatus* of old was so stiled *a Senioribus*; Whereas *Episcopus* signifies nothing but an *Over-seer*: And such indeed Bishops have been for many years.

Perhaps the Name of Bishop, is sometimes (though rarely) used, that the wilfully blind might stumble: But the Name Presbyter very frequent; that those who love Truth and Light might still see such a Glimps-

Glimpſe that might enlighten them in the midſt of the Ægyptian darkneſſe: from which, I doubt not, but God will deliver all Chriſtendom in due time,

I can find as little alſo for the *Office* of a Biſhop, as for his *Name* in Scripture, yea, much leſſe. I can find our Saviour rebuking his Diſciples, ſtriving for precedency, ſaying, *He that will be firſt ſhall be laſt.* I can find St. *Peter* ſaying, *Lord it not over the flock of Chriſt*: And St. *John* branding *Diotrephes* with ſeeking the *Preheminence.*

But where ſhall we find the uſurped *Office* of our Biſhops in all the Scripture? can they find it (by a multiplying glaſſe) where ever they ſee the *Name* of Biſhop, though but in a Poſtſcript, of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, Whither I ſee many of them fly for their own Name?

I muſt confeſſe I have found ſome *Preſcripts* of *Davids* Pſalms (and other Texts) to be now part of Scripture; but never yet found any *Poſtſcript* of ſuch Authority. I dare not therefore give it unto theſe;

Which, firſt, were never (that I could learn) received by the Church for *Authentick* Scripture; nor ever fully joined to the Scripture, [illegible] ſome diſtinctive note, [illegible] ſome ancient

Copies have them not at all; as one very old Greek Copy in *Oxford* Library, if I be not miſ-informed.

Again, theſe *Poſtſcripts* have many Improbabilities, and ſome repugnancies, as many learned men obſerve.

As that of the firſt to *Timothy*; *from Laodicea the chiefeſt City of Phrygia Pacatiana.* Which ſure was never ſo ſubſcribed by St. *Paul*, who would not have ſpoken of a Firſt Epiſtle, when as yet there was no ſecond, nor appearance of any. Again, the Epithet *Pacatiana* came from *Pacatianus* a Roman Deputy, 300 years after St. *Paul* wrote.

The Epiſtle to *Titus* is thus ſubſcribed, (or rather ſuperſcribed) *To Titus, ordained the firſt Biſhop of Creet*; *from Nicopolis of Macedonia*: but it ſhould have been added; *Whether St. Paul meant to come after the Epiſtle, but was not there at his writing*; as appears very probably from the third of the ſame Epiſtle, *v.* 12. But what means that phraſe, Biſhop of the *Church* in *Creet*? was there but one *Church* in all *Creet*? This ſounds not like the Scripture ſtile; which always expreſſeth National Congregations by *Churches* in the *Plurall*. But it may very well be, *Titus* was Biſhop (or Paſtor) but of one *Church* in *Creet*: ſo that we ſhall not need to contend about this.

Our

Our Adversaries themselves yield, there cannot be much urged from these *Subscriptions*. *Baronius*, *Serrarius*, and the *Rhemists* will ingenuously confess so much; and Bishop *Whitgift* also against Mr. *Cartwright*.

The *Postscripts* failing, where will they shew either *Name* or *Office* of a *Bishop*, as now it is used? I know their strong Fort, *Tit.* 1. 5. *For this cause I left thee in Creet, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, &c.* Here they think the power of a Bishop is set forth at large.

But what if so? Will they be content to be limited to this power? If so, we shall the sooner agree. I think no man ever thought, good *Titus* had a Commission here to draw the *Civil Sword*; or so much as to strike with his *Church Keys*.

Let us a little examine this *Commission* which seems but a Brief of a larger Patent which St. *Paul* had given before.

If we first examine the date of this *Commission*, we shall find it before any Church Government was setled; and so an Extraordinary case, not fit, perhaps not lawful to be produced as a constant president.

Extraordinary cases of Necessity, break through the *Ceremonial*, yea, *Morall Law* too. The Shew-bread may refresh faintaing *David*;

David; *Cain* and *Abel* may marry their own sisters to propagate the World; *Samuel* may be a Priest, though not of *Aarons* House, as was shewed before. And why then may not an Extraordinary way be taken in the first setling of Church Government, where there is yet none setled? Any man might now in the conversion of the *Americans*, or *Chinois*, give direction how to admit Members, elect Pastors, exercise the Keys, &c. This *Titus* did, and no more.

But secondly, in what manner his Commission was, I know not; and nothing can be proved from hence til that be agreed upon. It is as probable he did it but *instructivè*, *exhortativè*, and not *imperativè*, by way of instruction, and exhortation, not by way of command.

Tymothy received his gift by imposition of Presbyterial hands. If an extraordinary gift was conveighed in an ordinary way, Why might not an ordinary calling, and affairs of an ordinary nature be managed by an extraordinary man, be carried forth in an extraordinary way? The contrary is not proved, and so this must, til then, be inaffectual to them.

But thirdly, and lastly, I beseech you [illegible] did it by the

1. Who write.

2. Who proclaim the Gospel in an extraordinary way, as coadjutors and messengers to the Apostles in this great work.

Of this last sort certainly he was [*See* 2 *Cor.* 8. 23.] A Bishop he was not; for our adversaries do all agree, that it is the duty of a Bishop *curæ suæ incumbere*, to watch over his charge: now this he did not, for if *Creet* was his Charge (which in no way, neither by Scripture nor Antiquity is proved) he did not attend it; for we find him continually journeying up and down; he leaveth *Creet* & cometh to *Ephesus*, from thence he is sent to *Corinth*, after that into *Macedonia*, from *Macedonia* he is returned to the *Corinthians*. Neither is it to be found in History, that he ever returned to *Creet*. Thus, if I mistake not, the Text is lesse advantageous than the Postscript.

Some think to find Episcopacy established in that example of St. *John*, writing to the *Angels* of the seven Churches: but this is *Argumentum longe petitum*, a far fetcht argument.

Because *Paul* endorseth the Letter of a Corporation, or an Assembly, to the most eminent man in the Congregation; therefore he shall have sole Jurisdiction; therefore the Mayor [illegible] have sole power with-

out the Aldermen; *Eſt par ratio*, the reaſon is the ſame.

When *Paul* writes to the Church of the Theſſalonians (1 *Theſſ.* 5. v. 27.) commanding That Epiſtle to be read to all the Holy Brethren; the Church of the Theſſalonians ſhould have Juriſdiction over other Churches: which truly I do not think to be a ſtrong Argumentation.

Secondly, the Word is taken collectively for the Aſſembly and charge of Miniſters, and not for One, as appeareth evidently (*Rev.* 2. v. 24.) He ſaith, ſpeaking to the Angel, *To you*, and to the reſt in *Thyatira*: he puts the *Angel* in the plural number, which he would not have done, had he written to a ſingle Biſhop.

Thirdly, theſe Epiſtles are written to the whole Church; for the threats and promiſes are read to them, and the *Epiphonema* of every Epiſtle is this, He that hath an ear let him hear what's ſpoken to the Churches.

But yet if this ſuperſcription could give any advantage to the Angel, it would but extend to his own congregation.

The *Laodicean Angel* hath no influence upon the *Philadelphian* or the *Smyrnite*; and if that be not proved, nothing is gaind in the point of Epiſcopacy, except it could be proved that theſe Angels had in their care many

many congregations under theſe particular Churches: which never hath, nor ever will appear. I hope it is manifeſt to all men that they cannot eſtabliſh *Epiſcopacy* by Scripture.

Secondly, there is much in Scripture againſt them; For the word *Elder* and *Biſhop* is all one, *Tit.* 1. *v.* 7. *For this cauſe left I thee in Creet, that thou ſhouldſt ſet in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee; for a Biſhop muſt be blameleſſe, as the Steward of God.*

Firſt, he ſheweth *Titus* what manner of man an Elder muſt be, *viz. Blameleſſe*; and now proveth it, becauſe a Biſhop muſt be blameleſſe. As if I ſhould write to *Thomas* to live ſoberly, becauſe a *Man* muſt be ſober; it neceſſarily followeth, that *Thomas* is a man.

So that *Phil.* 1. he writes to the Biſhops and Deacons at *Philippi*. Is it probable that a little Town in *Macedonia* ſhould have many *Biſhops*, when one Biſhop muſt have many Cities in his Dioceſſe? Thoſe *Who tranſlated the Bible*, foreſaw This: And therefore *Acts* 20. They have tranſlated the word *Epiſcopus* an *Over-ſeer*. Yet in other places they tranſlate it *Biſhop*. And the Jeſuits ſay, *Piæ fraudes ſunt licitæ*, Honeſt craft is lawful.

The

The carriage of the Apoſtles, in ſeveral places is remarkable: when they come to a City (as *Acts* 20.) they ſend for the *Elders* of the Church, never thinking of a *Biſhop*, he is ſo inconſiderable a man. Theſe places I hope make clearly againſt them; So now I will endeavour to ſhew what the Scripture holdeth forth for Church Government.

CHAP. V.

What form of Church Government ſeems moſt conſonant to Scripture. *Whether* Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, *or* Democratical.

IN this ſearch, you will agree that the Government is fixed there, where you ſhall ſee ſetled the plenary and abſolute power of Election of Officers, Deciſion of Controverſies, and Excommunication of thoſe that tranſgreſſe.

This you will finde miniſterially in the Officers, but *initiativè, virtualiter, & concluſivè*, originally, virtually, and concluſively, in the People.

The Officers are called Overſeers, Rulers, and Elders, &c.

Some of theſe are to Preach and Adminiſter the Sacraments; others to watch over

over mens manners; [illegible]ers to serve Tables, and look to the poor: All these are chosen by the People; but whensoever by their industry any Delinquency is discovered, the whole matter is brought to the Church, and there the People and Elders do passe their definite sentence.

Examine but where election of Officers, decision of Controversies, and Excommunication of Members are recorded, and you shall have them all in the Church; not *representativè*, but in the whole Church, consisting of Officers and other Members.

As first for *Election*, *Acts* 1. 15. *Peter* speaks to the People, and telleth them they must choose one in *Judas* his place, and *verse* 23. it is said, *They* oppointed Two. It is true the lot divided which of them two should be the man; (a course in the like case not unlawfull to us at this day) but the reducing of it to Two was the act of the *Church*; though *Peter* was amongst them. So afterwards *Timothy* received his Evangelical gift by the Imposition of Presbyterial hands; which Presbyters were, in this work, the servants of one present Congregation.

Secondly, Decision of Controversies, either in Cases of Conscience, or in point of

of manners. In caſes of Conſcience; when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had no ſmall difference about Circumciſion, they ſent to *Jeruſalem* where the *Apoſtles*, *Elders*, and *Brethren* meeting together, joyntly returned that anſwer which you find *Acts* 15. 23, 24, 25.

Some would preſs this place, this act of the Apoſtles further, and give to every Synod a Commanding Power; becauſe it is ſaid *Acts* 15. 28. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to us, to lay no further burden upon you.* Therefore they ſay a Synod hath a commanding and burdening power.

But I cannot conſent to that: for then the major part of the Churches in *Europe*, *Africa*, *Preſter Johns* Country might meet and command all the Churches of Chriſt (which God forbid) in what they pleaſed; and that *jure divino*: for God when he giveth a rule to his Church, he ſpeaketh to the whole Church of Chriſt, and not to any particular Congregation. I onely preſſe it thus far, That the *People* were joyned even with the *Apoſtles* in that Great Synod.

The commanding power of the Synod lay in this, that the Apoſtles ſpeak the mind of the Holy Ghoſt: But ſuch authority is not left in us; and therefore no ſuch

ſuch Obligation upon others. Truly if there were ſuch a power left us, I ſhould with much ſcruple reſiſt any act of ſuch Government, whereof I could make a good conſtruction; for many times the power Commanding is more dangerous than the thing commanded: but there is no ſuch power. Neither, as I ſaid before, do I preſſe it with ſuch a deſign.

In caſes of civil converſe, *Mat.* 18. 17. we muſt make our addreſſes to the Church, and he that will not hear the Church muſt be as a Publican.

In that place the greateſt diſpute will be, What is meant by the Church? for ſome will ſay, here is meant the Church *repreſentative*; either in *more*, as the Presbytery, or in *one*, as the *Biſhop*, and not the Church at large.

But I would labour to evince the contrary. Weigh either the Context, or the generall ſignification of the word *Church*, and I hope the true ſenſe will be manifeſt.

For, let us ſee how *Church* is taken in the Scripture: It is uſed ſometimes *figurativè*; and ſometimes *properly*. *Figurativè*, as when a particular houſe is called a *Church*; As, *the Church in his houſe*, Rom. 16. 5.

Secondly, When by *Synecdoche* the head is put for the whole; as Chriſt is called the *Church*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12.

Thirdly, *Collectivè*, When all the Churches of Chriſt are called the *Church*, 1 *Cor.* 10.32. It is uſed perhaps under ſome other figures, but it will be long to quote them all.

Secondly, it is uſed properly in two phraſes;

Firſt, When the Congregation is called the Church; as the Church at *Epheſus*, *Corinth*, &c. Secondly, When the Congregations are called *Churches*; as the *Churches of Galatia*, and of *Judea*. Thus it is uſed *Properly*, Thus *Figuratively*; but no where *repreſentativè*: *ſcil.* the Miniſters, the Presbyters, or the Biſhops, or all theſe for the Church. You ſhall find theſe and the Church contradiſtinct; as, *To the Saints, the Biſhops, and the Deacons*, 1 *Phil.* 1. 1. *To the Church, and the Elders*, *Acts* 15. 4.

I conceive we are bound to take a word in that ſenſe which is currant in Scripture, except that ſenſe clearly croſſe the ſcope and drift of the text.

You ſhall meet with that word 48 times in the new Teſtament, and no where ſignifying that which we call the *Repreſentative*

tative Church: Very often for the Saints themſelves: As 1 *Cor.* 1. *v.*15. 2 *Cor.* 1.*v.*1. 1 *Theſ.* 1. *v.* 1. Why ſhould we not then take it in the ſame ſence? Are we not then bound to expound the word *Church* in ſome of thoſe ſignifications which are frequent in Scripture: and not in that ſenſe which is ſo far from being found in the Text, that a Contradiſtinct phraſe is, as I ſaid before, rather uſed?

Again, from the Text, and Context, That will appear to be the meaning of the Spirit, and no other: The text is, *Mat.* 18. *v.* 17. *If he ſhall neglect to hear them, tell the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen man and a Publican.* The context is in the 15. and 16. verſes. *If thy brother ſhall treſpaſſe againſt thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: If he ſhall hear thee, then haſt thou gained thy brother: but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one, or two more; that in the mouth of two or three Witneſſes every word may be eſtabliſhed.*

In the context and the text there are three things to be examined, before the true ſenſe can be found out: Firſt, Who are meant in that *Gradation*, in the 15, 16, 17. *ver.* Secondly, Who is meant by

Thee. verſe 17. *Let him be to thee.* Thirdly, What is meant by *Publicans* and *ſinners.*

Firſt, Who is meant in that *Gradation?* In the firſt place is meant the Party; in the ſecond part of the *Gradation*, where it is ſaid, *Take with thee one or two more*; is meant the Elders, or the Biſhops, the Officers of the Church.

If you ſay, they are not there underſtood: yet I am confident you will not, I am ſure you cannot ſay they are there excluded. If then the Spirit pointed at them with the other members of the *Church*, or *them ſolely*; it would be an unneceſſary thing to bring *him* afterwards to *them* again, as to the *Repreſentative* Church.

Secondly, by *Thee* (*v.*17.) is not meant only the Party, but every Chriſtian, every Church member, to whomſoever the news of ſuch a miſcarriage ſhall come: elſe this will be a meanes to nouriſh particular parties ſidings, (which the Scripture doth exceedingly ſhun) If by Gods Law he ſhould be a Publican to one of the Church and not to another: If he be ſo to every member of the Church, this will be a hard caſe, that if a Biſhop, or an Elder, one, two, or more, ſhall paſſe the bitter ſentence of Excommunication, he muſt be

be ſo to me alſo, though I know nothing of it.

But ſome will ſay, that muſt be done before the Church. To which I anſwer, the word ſaith no ſuch matter. And thus thoſe who miſ-expound the Scripture, muſt eek out the Scripture to make good their own imagination.

But ſecondly, why ſhould it be complained of before the Church, if the deciding power be in Officers? *Fruſtra fit per plura, quod fieri poteſt per pauciora,* It is in vain to have that done by many, which may be done by a few.

But thirdly and laſtly, if you will have the whole Church hear; it ſeemeth to me againſt all reaſon in the world, that the party deputed ſhould have power, the party deputing being preſent. The Steward of a Court Leet, or Court Baron, is annihilated, if the Lord be there. All Officers vail bonnet, when the party giving them power is preſent.

Why are Parliaments the repreſentative body of the Kingdome, but becauſe the Plough cannot ſtand? but becauſe no place can contain the whole body? but if all the people could meet in *Campo Martio*, ſhould thoſe who now are but ſervants then be more than ſervants? ſurely the

whole Church being preſent, four or five by Gods Law ſhall not rule all, ſeeing Gods Law never appoints any ſtanding Laws againſt the rules of nature.

In the third place we muſt enquire after the ſenſe of *Heathen* and *Publican*: *ſc.* the moſt odious of men. Is it poſſible that any Chriſtian ſhall be to any Chriſtian the moſt odious of men, for the ſentence of a Judge which he never heard, neither hath right to hear?

Thus, if you will be bound either by *Text* or *Context*, or the *common acceptation* of the word in the Scripture; by *Church* muſt be underſtood the whole Congregation.

Again, for excommunication of Members, 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. St. *Paul* commandeth them (*ſc.* the whole Church) to put away that wicked perſon, and to deliver up ſuch a one to Satan, 2 *Cor.* 2. They reſtore him, they forgive him.

Thus we ſee every where, that in Election of Officers, in Deciſion of Controverſies, in caſes of Conſcience, in Excommunication, the whole Church diſpoſeth every thing, not the *Biſhops*, not the Preſbyters alone.

I do not obſerve the Church hath power in other things, but in theſe, and

in

in all theſe, in Election of Officers, in Deciſion of Controverſies, and Excommunication of Delinquents, the whole power is in the Church.

I conceive then I have clearly and briefly proved theſe three things:

1. That there is little in Scripture for Epiſcopacy; much leſſe for ſuch an Epiſcopacy as Ours.

2. Something againſt them.

3. Another Government clearly delineated.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Conſequents that may poſſibly follow the change of Church-Government. Of the great danger of Schiſms, Sects, and Hereſies. Of One new Sect *to come in the laſt dayes. Whether Biſhops can keep the Church from Schiſms, Sects, &c. What is, or who are the* Cauſe *of moſt* Schiſms *amongſt us.*

IT being (as I conceive it is) cleared both from *State-policy*, *Antiquity* and *Scripture*, how incompatible Civil Government and ſuch Epiſcopacy are, I hope we ſhall never hereafter be choaked with that Proverb, *No Biſhop, no King.* I do moſt willingly pay very great reverence to

a ſaying delivered to us by many ſucceſſions, from the wiſedom of our fore-fathers; But I ſhall ever crave leave to queſtion that Maxime which may juſtly ſeem to me the birth either of Ignorance, or Ends. *Antiquity* muſt have no more authority than what it can maintain, by reaſon frequent impoſtures of this nature command us to be circumſpect; did not our Predeceſſors hold the Torrid Zone *inhabitabilem eſtu*, too hot to live in? till *Noahs* Dove, *Columbus* diſcovered Land, the World was confined in the Ark of *Europe*, *Africa*, and *Aſia*.

In Divinity, where an error is of moſt dangerous conſequence, we have been too credulous: how many hundred years did our fore-fathers ſwallow this pleaſant baite, *We muſt believe as the Church believeth?* And ſince the light of Reformation, Was not particular aſſurance of our Salvation delivered us, as an exact definition of our faith?

We have ventured our bodies as well as our ſouls upon theſe ſands; for in the Art of Phiſicke (though our Parents at a very great remoteneſſe were wiſer) it hath paſſed for a currant poſition that Phlebotomy almoſt in any caſe was more than dangerons. And that men might

pay

pay deare for their Learning. They have been as wiſe in Tenets of State-Policy.

Have not too many great ones cloſed in with *Nero*'s concluſion, *me oderint dum metuant*, Let them hate me ſo they fear me?

Laſtly, Epiſcopacy hath been the baſis, the ſuperſtructure, the All, the ſoul of Church Diſcipline for theſe many Ages: but *Dabit his meliora Deus*, God will deal better with us.

Some of theſe Tenets ſpring from invincible Ignorance; others have been the baſe pullulations of ſpirits enſlaved to falſe ends: This, *No Biſhop, No King* (as I have fully proved) partakes of both; and therefore hath no weight with me, nor I hope ſhall ever hereafter be of credit with any body elſe; for we ſee that old received truths are not always to be entertained: and ſo I leave them with their maxime to the ſentence of every judicious Reader.

There yet remaineth an objection or two which muſt neceſſarily receive an anſwer, before I ſhut up this diſcourſe.

Obj. Allow there are ſome inconveniences (yea, great ones) in Epiſcopacy; yet *ex malis minimum*, of evils we muſt take the

the leaſt: it is better to bear theſe than to groan under worſe. If Epiſcopacy be taken away, *Schiſmes* and *Hereſies* will break in as armed men; *Tyranny* is more eligible than *Anarchy*; the woful ſenſe of *Anarchy* begot that ſad proverb, *It is as it was with Iſrael, when there was no King.*

Anſ. I do agree to this, that a confuſion is a moſt lamentable condition; and that thoſe times are very perillous, when every mans hand is up againſt his brother; *Ephraim* againſt *Manaſſes*, and *Manaſſes* againſt *Ephraim*: Yea, I do profeſſe the diſtraction of *Hereſies*, the moſt miſerable of all. Civil conquaſſations disjoint the outward eſtate; but *Hereſies* diſtract our ſouls, diſmember our Churches, ſtave off Jew and Gentile, who know not whether part to believe, ſhake the weaker, cauſe heart-burning amongſt the ſtronger, do exceedingly provoke God to wrath and diſpleaſure. But firſt, let us conſider whether it be poſſible to be without Hereſies and Schiſms. Secondly, whether Epiſcopacy be not the efficient cauſe of the moſt grievous Schiſms and Hereſies. Thirdly, whether thoſe which may juſtly be feared upon the removall of Epiſcopacy, be of ſuch dangerous conſequence, as to weigh down the keeping up of that Government rather

rather than tohazard what inconveniences may there-hence follow.

And firſt to the firſt of theſe.

It will be cleer both from experience, and Scripture, and reaſon, that Hereſies muſt come. Look over all Nations, and all times, and you ſhall find them diſtracted with difference of opinions: How many ſeverall Sects do you hear of amongſt the Jews, and ſome of them extreme groſſe? the Sadduces, the Phariſees, the Eſſeans, Herodians, with many more; though a great Critick reduce them to three. Chriſt had no ſooner committed the care of his Church to the Apoſtles, Diſciples, and ordinary Miniſters, but they were over-run with hereſies: Yea, in their time, ſome were of *Paul*, ſome of *Apollo*, ſome of *Cephas*; in the interim *Chriſt* quite laid aſide. In the Church of *Pergamus*, were there not ſome that held the Doctrine of the *Nicolaitans?* In *Thyatira* did not ſome of the Church liſten to the Propheteſſe *Jezebel*, who taught them to commit fornication, and ſo eat things offered unto Idols? *Barnabas* and *Paul* were at ſome difference: the doctrine of works was preſſed upon the *Galatians*, and the reſurrection from the dead queſtioned by the *Corinthians*.

Amongſt

Amongst *Heathens* (where Morality was their God) had you not the *Peripateticks*, the *Scepticks*, the *Platonists*, the *Epicureans*, and many other Sects? The Pope and Papacy have been much turmoyled with Schisms, and these Schisms have produced great confusions amongst them.

In the year of the Lord 420. *Boniface* the eighth being chosen, the Clergy chose *Eulatius*, and then they decreed one another Hereticks; *Symmachus* and *Laurentius* caused the same distraction in the year 499 760. Pope *Custantine* being convinced of Schisms and bereft of both his eyes, he and *Philip* (another Pope) were deposed, and *Stephen* elected in their places. Thus it was 958. 973. 995. 1047. 1058. 1062. 1083. 1100. 1118. 1124. in the year of the Lord 1130. the disputes betwixt *Gregory* and *Peter* (both chosen Popes) were so famous that it was grown a Proverb, and recorded in this Verse.

Petrus habet Romam, totam Gregorius orbem:
Peter possessed *Rome*, and *Gregory* the rest of the World.

Every twenty years had such changes as these, even till of late, that Church hath been vehemently turmoiled with all their Learned. Amongst the School-men, some

some are *Scotists*, some *Thomists*: among the *Polemicks*, some *Jesuites*, some *Dominicans*. And all these wrangle each with other.

In the year of our Lord 1400. there was a great dispute about the Original sin of the *Virgin Mary*. Between 1215. and 1294. was that great Faction between the *Guelfians* and *Gibelines* (though both were Papists) one defending the authority of the Pope, the other of the Emperor. In some points of Controversie, *Bellarmine* (one of the ablest Writers) is not to be read without restriction, and not without license of Superiors.

If we survey all Antiquity, we shall find no one Century free from Hereticks, *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, *Marcion*, *Samusatenus*, *Novatians*, *Sabellians*, *Nepotians*, *Maniches*, *Arrians*, *Pelagians*, with many others, have troubled the Church from time to time.

If you descend so low as our dayes, even among Protestants, you shall meet with too too many Divisions. *Luther* and *Calvin*; and the English Church between both; a *Calvinist* for Doctrine, a *Lutheran* for Discipline. The *Lutherans* are divided in *Rigidiores*, & *Molliores*, the *More rigid*, and the *More moderate*; and these differ *toto Cœlo*, as far as Heaven and Earth.

The

The *Calviniſts* have many diſputes: How fiercely doth learned *Eraſtus* contend with *Calvin* and *Beza*, about *Excommunication*, denying the Church any ſuch power?

The Church of *England* hath three main Diviſions: The *Conformiſt*, the *Non Conformiſt*, and the *Separatiſt*. The *Conformiſt* hath the *Orthodox* Divine contending with the *Arminian*, *Socinian*, *Pelagian*, *Anabaptiſt*, and divers others; who yet All ſtile themſelves Sons of the Church of *England*. The *Non-conformiſt* is uncertain what he ſcrupleth; for ſome can diſpence with one of the three Grand Nocent-innocent Ceremonies? ſome with another; ſome with neither. The *Separatiſt* is ſubdivided too (as they ſay) into *Separatiſt*, and *Semi-ſeparatiſt*. Many other Diviſions there alſo be, and will be, in Churches here.

Yea, it is clear in Reaſon, that Diviſions, Sects, Schiſms, and Hereſies muſt come; For, many are apt to advance themſelves and undervalue all others: and Mens Brains being fertile of errors, after they have conceived they muſt bring forth; though the Goſpel ſuffer never ſo much by it. And while this Temper is among men, you muſt ſtil expect *Schiſmes*, and *Hereſies*.

The

The Scripture hath put this out of all doubt, it saith, *Heresies must come.* Christ came to set a Sword, not onely between the Good and bad, but even among Professors of the same Christian Religion; that those who hold out to the end may have their Honour and Reward. It is to be marked that Christ doth not presse his people to seek their freedom, til *Rome* be falling, and then he saith, *Come out of her my People.*

Yea, the Scripture fore-telleth of one *Heresie*, that is not yet (perhaps) come; it may be it is now in the Birth, sure it is not far off: It is mentioned in the second of *Tymothy*, the third Chapter, and some of the first verses.

1. *This know also, that in the last days perillous times shall come.*

2. *For men shall be lovers of their own selves covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to Parents, unthankful, unholy.*

3. *Without natural affection, truce-breakers, false-accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good.*

4. *Traitors, heady, high minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.*

5. *Having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.*

Exposi-

Expoſitors all agree This miſery to be in the Wain: But in their agreement they differ very much; for ſome conceive the *Papiſt* is here underſtood; others apply it to the late Troublers of *Iſrael*, the *Arminian*, *Socinian*, and the worſt ſort of Epiſcopal men, that under the notion of indifferent Ceremonies would have brought us to ſwallow down all *Popery*.

But under favour, I doubt neither of Theſe reach the full meaning of the Text. It cannot be the *Papiſt*, becauſe it is not to riſe untill the *Laſt Dayes*. Indeed *Popery* is cleerly expreſſed in the 1 of *Tim.* the fourth, verſe the 1, 2, 3. (as that moſt Learned and reverend man Mr. *Mead* hath fully cleared in his moſt excellent piece on that Text) yet there it is ſaid to riſe in the Latter Times (*viz.* of the Roman Empire;) but here theſe new Hereticks come not out til the *Laſt* (not only *Latter*) *Dayes*, not only *Times*, but *Days* of thoſe *Times*.

Again, it ſeems not to be the *Arminian* (or any of that Rabble I mentioned but now.) For firſt, the Character of their Times is Perillous, as if it would intimate men indeed ſhould be in danger, but yet eſcape, the Times being only perillous: But while Popery bore all before it, forced the

the whole Church into the Wilderneſſe, cloathed the Witneſſes with Sackcloath, and at laſt prevailes to kill them: ſure Theſe Times are more than perillous. But perhaps there is no preſſing force in this.

In the ſecond place let us conſider the Character of the perſons. Firſt, they are expreſſed as Breakers of the Lawes, of *Civil Converſe*; and then as *Hypocrites* in *Religion*: the firſt of theſe beginneth at the ſecond, and continueth to the fifth verſe: The ſecond is in the fifth and ſixth verſes. Let us view ſome paſſages in both.

Lovers of themſelves, Covetous, Proud, &c. And have not men been ſuch ever ſince *Adam?* Why then doth the Spirit ſpeak of This, as a ſtrange thing in the *Laſt Dayes?* Mr. *Calvin* ſaw this Objection, and therefore oft affirmes (That the Scripture may not ſeem to ſpeak *Frigidè*, unaptly.) Here muſt be ſome new ſtrange Crew of men, that act all Theſe in a moſt eminent manner, even to the eye of all men.

But ſome will ſay, Are not the *Papiſts* ſo? Is not the corrupter part of *Prelates* ſuch? Are not the *Arminians* of this temper? Certainly they are ſuch, and in

an eminent manner: and yet to me they seem not the men the Spirit pointeth at in this place.

The main Thing in which these men (here exprest) pride themselves, is not Learning, or Parts; But (if I be not much mistaken) somewhat beyond and within all these: That, I suppose, which seems to them to be the Spirit. This, I conceive is the *Basis* of all their vanity, pride, and insolence. They have the Spirit, and so know more than all the Learned, Pious, Godly Men in the world. They have the Spirit, they cannot sin, they cannot err. They will not pray, but when that Spirit moves. *Adultery* is but an act of the Flesh, but they are all Spirit, and no Flesh. What should these men do with Natural affections, they are all Spirit? in this case if they be Traytors, High-minded, Heady, &c. Who will wonder? What may they not be carried up to, by the imagination of the Spirit? But let them take heed, if they had any thing of God in them; let them be wise in this their day, for the time may come when it will be too late. In the mean time I will say as *Peter* did to *Simon*, *Pray* (that if it be possible) *this wickedness of heart may be forgiven.*

If

If we look on the other part of their Character, *Having a form of Godlineſſe, but denying the power thereof, Creeping into the Houſes of ſilly women, Laden with divers Luſts*, &c.

How can theſe be ſpoken of *Arminians*, *Socinians*, or our Prelates? It were to be wiſhed that moſt of Theſe had ſo much as a *Forme* of Godlineſſe. Sure the world is now grown too wiſe to take Duckings, and Cringings, Croſſing, and Crouching, with all of this kind to be ſo much as a *Form* of Godlineſſe.

Do Theſe creep into Womens houſes? the *Socinians* and *Arminians* attempt no ſuch prankes, that I know of. And the Patrons of Epiſcopacy uſe not much perſwaſion, but Club law: All elſe is in Corners.

It ſeems very probable to me, that the Holy Ghoſt in This text points out ſome ſuch, as the *Family of Love*, the *Antinomians* and *Grindletonians* are, if (at leaſt) they are not much belyed. And to theſe, I think every piece of This Character will moſt properly belong. Yea, and the Cloſe of it alſo, or the Iſſue of That Sect. *They ſhall proceed no farther, for their folly ſhall be made manifeſt to all men*, which can hardly be underſtood either of *Arminianiſm*

or *Prelacy*, ſince *That* in ſeveral Names, *This* in ſeveral dreſſes hath been in the world above 1000 years.

Thus you ſee *Sects*, *Schiſms*, and *Hereſies* will ſtill come, and muſt come: And therefore if by keeping ſuch Biſhops we think to keep out all Diviſions, we are much deceived. Which yet I ſpeak not to take away watchfulneſſe in Church-Governours, (who are ſtil bound to ſuppreſſe Diviſions as much as they can) but to convince men of this (if I can) that *Epiſcopacy* is never like to prevent Schiſms, which I hope to cleer more fully in my ſubſequent diſcourſe.

I could never conceive more than Two ways, that in probability may be like to quiet us in reſpect of Diviſions. One of theſe we have no mind to try, and the other we may not if we would.

The Spaniard indeed by his cruel *Inquiſition* hath inclined his Subjects to a kind of *Unity*, but an Unity of Darkneſſe and Ignorance: ſo that the Remedy proves worſe than the Diſeaſe. Neither will, or can Tyranny either Civil, or Eccleſiaſtick, bring forth better fruit.

The other *Way* is that of the *United Provinces* (in the Low Countries) who let every *Church* pleaſe her ſelf in her own way,

way, ſo long as ſhe leaveth the *State* to her ſelf. And how Religion doth flouriſh there is known to moſt men. I will not diſpute This now; only I wiſh heartily, men would remember, that *Nature* her ſelf as much abhors a *forced violent Union*, as a *Rent*, or *Diviſion*.

But in the next place, let us ſeriouſly conſider, whether the Biſhops (as now they be ſetled here) be not the Cauſe of moſt Sects, Schiſms, and Hereſies now amongſt us.

Some of them will not deny themſelves to be *Arminians*; and others cannot deny themſelves *Socinians*. If at leaſt they think we can underſtand their Writings, Printings, yea, and Sermons, though Theſe be very rare.

Yea, ſome do not deny, but they may (at leaſt) receive Orders from *Rome*; they meane a Pale, Mitre, and Cardinalls Hat, if they come. All which we may yet better conſtrue by their carriage to Prieſts and Jeſuites, both in publick and private, which now we know more than by bare ſurmiſe. Many of theſe they countenance openly, and never queſtion any, though it be certainly known: we had (they had) more ſuch in *London*, than were good Miniſters in all *England* almoſt.

All the Livings under moſt of our Biſhops have been committed to the cure and care of ſuperſtitious Formaliſts, Arminians, Socinians, Papiſts, or Atheiſts. Yea, the Univerſities are much corrupted by their malignant influence; for *Nero*-like they think they have done nothing, till they have murdered their own Mother. In a word, through the whole Kingdom, Preaching, Praying, Expounding, and the like exerciſes, both in publick, and private, are ſeverely ſuppreſſed, and in many places altogether forbidden (except ſuch and ſuch, more pernicious than profitable;) and all this by the Fathers of our Church, the Lords our Biſhops. And is not this the moſt compendious way poſſible to beget and encreaſe *Hereſies?*

They cry out of Schiſm, Schiſm, Sects and Schiſms, and well they may: They make them, and it is ſtrange they ſhould not know them. When they laid ſuch ſtumbling blocks (Reall Scandals, not only *accepta*, but *data*, not taken, but given,) in the way of good men, whoſe Conſciences they have grievouſly burdened, and wounded with things (violently preſſed on the greateſt fines) that are ſo far from being indifferent, that many of them were point blanck unlawful: have they

they not by this even forced their bretheren to ſeparate themſelves in Judgement and Practice, till they could find ſome remote place that might ſeparate their bodies alſo? Was not this in them the readieſt way to produce Diviſions, Separations, and (as they call it) *Schiſmes* in the Church? Rents are bad, I confeſſe, wherever they be violent; but yet then worſt, when moſt out of the eye. *Schiſms* in the *Conſcience* are of greateſt danger; and to prevent theſe, if I am forc'd to that, which they pleaſe to call a *Schiſme* in the Church, Woe to him that ſo forceth me. Scandals, Schiſms, and Diviſions muſt come; but woe to him by whom they come. God forgive them in this particular.

I profeſſe I take no pleaſure in ripping up their foul, loathſome ſores; I would they could be thoroughly healed without launcing and opening. I could give you a ſtrange account of ſad Diviſions, which themſelves have cauſed both to *Church* and *State*: I could tire you and my ſelf in this, though I ſhould begin but little higher than mine own time, mine own Knowledge.

In Queen *Elizabeths* time, many good men were cut off from the *Church*, ſome

from the *State*; a ſad Schiſm! ſome by violence laid aſleep; Many ſuſpended, ſilenced, deprived, cut off (by a ſtrange Schiſm) from Liberty, Livings, (that I go not higher;) and all this for one word, of their own compounding, *Non-Conformity*: while they themſelves are indeed the greateſt *Non-Conformiſts* to all the *Reformed Churches* in *Europe*.

Surely it would have ſavoured more of Humility, of Chriſtianity, if they had ſuſpected their own Judgements and Opinions, allowing ſomething to the Judgement, Learning and Piety of thoſe holy, worthy precious Saints, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Bucer*, *P. Martyr*, *Oecolampadius*, *Zuinglius*, with many more great, famous, and eminent Lights in their times.

If they will ſtand for *Conformity*, let any man living judge, whether it be fitter for ſome few Biſhops, newly come out of groſſe Popery, (and ſtill retaining their old Popiſh Ceremonies) to *Reform* and *Conform* themſelves to the Judgement and Practice of all *Reformed Churches*; or all Churches to ſubſcribe to them.

As they began, ſo they continued: Chriſt and they being like parallel lines, though they ſhould run out *in infinitum*, they would never meet: Nay, rather like the

Crura

Crura of a *Triangle*, the farther they run (out from the Centre) the more they differ, and are diſtant each from other.

Under King *James*, in a few years, four or five hundred Reverend men were divided from their Livings and Miniſtery: and was not this a cruel Schiſm? Now alſo by them was firſt forged that ſharp *Raſor* (or *Book of Sports*) with which they have ſince made great *Diviſions* of *heart*.

But in our Gracious Kings Reign, they have come to Cutting off Ears, Cheeks; and have yet ſtruck deeper, and eſſayed many *Soul-Schiſmes*, not only in the Hearts and Conſciences of thouſands of good men, but whole States alſo and Kingdoms, as much as in them lay.

While I hear the ſad groans, and ſee the bleeding wounds of Three Kingdoms at once, by their Schiſms, I have almoſt forgotten the parting ſighs, and farewell tears of ten thouſand poor Chriſtians, by their Tyranny forc'd to abandon their native Country and deareſt Acquaintance; while others were here violently detained in Fetters, ſome ſmothered in Dungeons, ſome diſmembred, ſome driven out of Houſe and Living, and forced to beg: All which yet would have been born patient-

patiently, had not onely all good men, but Goodneſs it ſelf, Learning, Religion, Piety, all that ſpeaks any worth, been altogether, not onely diſcountenanced, but ſuppreſſed, ſmothered, and by moſt exquiſite Tortures almoſt forced to breath its laſt.

Yet that theſe Glorious Princes (under whom ſuch Tyrannies have been committed) may not ſuffer in your thoughts, Give me leave to ſpeak ſome things on mine own knowledge and experience, others from beſt intelligence. Queen *Elizabeth*, when ſhe heard of their miſcarriages, fell on them in moſt ſharp language, threatning Them, if ever they ſhould do the like againe to her Subjects.

King *James* offered fair diſcourſe to the *Non-Conformiſts*; honoured Mr. *Cartwright* and others of them; diſclaimed the Book of Sports: And being asked why he made ſo many Bad Biſhops, anſwered ingenuouſly, with a ſtrong aſſeveration, *That he was very ſorry, but could not help it; For, no good men would take the Office on them.* And our Gracious Sovereign (ſince ſome light dawned out of darkneſſe,) hath delivered our Siſter Church of *Scotland* from that unhappy Generation.

For,

For, now I hope the Clouds begin to break away; Light ſpringeth up, while Dark Iniquity is forced not only to ſhut her mouth, but hide her ſelf and diſappear. Now the Sun again mounteth up in our *Horizon*, and quickeneth the drooping ſpirits; ſo that many that were Bedrid ſome months ſince, now begin to take up their Beds and walk, leaping up and bleſſing God.

Fire and *Water* may be reſtrained, but *Light* cannot; it will in at every cranny, and the more it is oppoſed, it ſhines the brighter: ſo that now to ſtint it, is to reſiſt an *enlightened, enflamed Multitude*; which ſtil was, and ſtill will be *Duriſſima Provincia*, an hard task.

Their mad outrage in all the three Kingdomes, of late, hath ſo incenſed the common People, that in all mens eyes they are become moſt vile: and while all men reflect on their conſtant trade of miſchievous practices, the wiſeſt begin to conclude, The very Calling hurts the Men, as much as theſe diſgrace the Calling.

Thus we have by too too long, great, and ſad experience, found it true, That our Prelates have been ſo far from preventing Diviſions; that they have been the

the Parents and Patrons of moſt Errors, Hereſies, Sects and Schiſms that now diſturb this Church and State.

CHAP. VII.

The danger of Schiſmes *and* Sects *more fully diſcuſſed: the Nature and danger of* Anabaptiſm, Separatiſm, *and* Unlicenſed Preaching. *The Concluſion with an affectionate deſire of Peace and Union.*

BUt it may be, the *Remedy* will be worſe than this *Diſeaſe*. Let us therefore, yet more exactly weigh all the Inconveniences that may attend the Change of this Church-Government, which we now diſpute.

The dangers which ſome have fancied may hence accrew to the State, have been diſcuſſed in the former Section, to which more properly they do belong. We have here only to conſider ſuch Evils as may have bad influence into the Church, and Policy thereof.

Arminianiſm, *Socinianiſm*, *Superſtition*, *Idolatry*, *Popery*, will pack away with them; being their Attendants, as was ſhewed

ſhewed before. What is there then to be feared? *Anabaptiſm*, *Browniſm*, *Separatiſm*; nay, every body, every Layman will turn preacher.

Suppoſe all this be true, (which can be but ſuppoſed;) Would it not be much better to hazzard the comming in of all theſe, than ſtil to ſuffer our Soules and bodies to be grownd to powder by theſe Tyrannical, Antichriſtian Prelates, that under pretence of keeping out *Separatiſm*, introduce down-right *Popery*, and a ſink of almoſt all errors and Hereſies? Yea, and theſe Errors of the Right Hand (which theſe pretend ſo much to oppoſe) owe their birth to our Biſhops alſo; as was but now, and might yet more fully be cleered. We all know, that within theſe ten years all the *Non-Conformiſts* in England could not amount to more than one or two hundred: And now how many thouſands there be (yea, of ſuch that riſe one pin higher than old *Non-conformity*,) Themſelves, perhaps, know much better than I: Yet our Biſhops never were more active than in all this time. Whence then ariſeth this new *Non-conformity*, or *Separatiſm*, but out of our Biſhops commotions? I will not ſay as the Fathers did of old, *Ex martyrum ſanguine pullulat Eccleſia*, the Church

Church doth ſpring out of the *blood* of the Martyrs: yet I muſt confeſſe, I begin to think there may be perhaps ſomewhat more of God in theſe (which they call new *Schiſmes*) than appeares at firſt glympſe.

I will not, I cannot, take on me to defend That, men uſually call *Anabaptiſm*: Yet I conceive that Sect is Twofold: Some of them hold *Free-will*; *Community* of all things; deny *Magiſtracy*; and refuſe to *Baptize* their Children. Theſe truly are ſuch *Hereticks* (or *Atheiſts*,) that I queſtion whether any Divine ſhould honor them ſo much as to diſpute with them; much rather ſure ſhould *Alexanders* ſword determine here, as of old at the Gordian knot, where it acquired this Motto, *Quæ ſolvere non poſſum, diſſecabo*, What I cannot *unty*, I will *cut* aſunder.

There is another ſort of them, who onely deny *Baptiſm* to their Children, til they come to yeares of diſcretion, and then they *baptize* them; but in other things they agree with the Church of *England*.

Truly, theſe men are much to be pittied; And I could heartily wiſh, That before they be ſtigmatiz'd with that opprobious brand of *Schiſmatick*, the Truth might

might be cleered to them. For I conceive, to thoſe that hold we may go no farther than *Scripture*, for Doctrine, or Diſcipline, it may be very eaſie to err in this point now in hand; ſince the Scripture ſeemes not to have cleerly determined This Particular.

The Analogy which *Baptiſm* now hath with *Circumciſion* in the old Law, is a fine Rhetorical Argument, to illuſtrate a point well proved before; but I ſomewhat doubt, whether it be proof enough, for that which ſome would prove by it: ſince (beſide the vaſt difference in the Ordinances,) the perſons to be Circumciſed are ſtated by a poſitive Law, ſo expreſſe, that it leaves no place for ſcruple: but it is far otherwiſe in *Baptiſm*; Where all the deſignation of perſons fit to be partakers, for ought I know, is only, *Such as believe.* For this is the qualification that, with exacteſt ſearch, I find the Scripture requires in perſons to be *baptized*: And *This* it ſeems to require in All ſuch perſons. Now how Infants can be properly ſaid to *believe*, I am not yet fully reſolved.

Yet many things prevail very much with me in this point.

Firſt, For ought I could ever learn, It was the conſtant cuſtom of the pureſt and moſt

moſt Primitive Church, to baptize *Infants* of believing Parents; for I could never finde the beginning and firſt Riſe of this practice: Whereas it is very eaſie to track Hereſies to their firſt Riſing up, and ſetting foot in the Church.

Again, I find all Churches, even the moſt ſtrict, have generally been of this judgement and practice: yea, though there have been in all ages ſome that much affected Novelty, and had parts enough to diſcuſſe and clear what they thought good to preach; yet was this ſcarce ever queſtioned by men of Note, till within theſe Laſt Ages. And ſure, the conſtant judgement of the Churches of Chriſt, is much to be honoured, and heard in all things that contradict not Scripture.

Nor can I well clear that of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Elſe were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* I know ſome interpret it thus, *If it be unlawfull for a Believer to live in Wedlock with one that believeth not; Then have many of you lived a long time in unlawfull Marriage; and ſo your very Children muſt be Illegitimate, and Theſe alſo muſt be caſt off (as Baſe-born:) But it is not ſo; for, Your Children are Holy;* that is, *Legitimate.*

I confeſſe, this ſeems a very fair Interpretation; yet I much queſtion whether This be all the Apoſtle meanes by that phraſe *Holy*; eſpecially when I reflect on the preceding words, *The Unbeliever is ſanctified by the Believer.* Nor yet can I believe any *Inherent Holineſs* is here meant; but rather That *Relative Church-Holineſs*, which makes a man capable of Admiſſion to *Holy Ordinances*, and ſo to *Baptiſme*: yea, and to the *Lords Supper* alſo, for ought I ſee; except perhaps Infants be excluded from This Sacrament, by that text, *Let him that eateth, examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat.* As *Women* are excluded from Church-Government and Preaching in Congregations, by That of the ſame Apoſtle, *I permit not a Woman to ſpeak*; *Let Women keep ſilence.*

The ſecond thing we fear ſo much, is *Separation*, or, as ſome term it, *Browniſm*; for I am not ſo well ſtudied in theſe, as to give an exact difference between them, or properly to ſtate or phraſe either. Yet I think This alſo hath Latitude, and admits of difference. Before you paſſe any ſevere cenſure, be pleaſed to hear theſe Poor men (you call *Separatiſts*;) Know their Tenets, and then judge.

Their main Tenets (for ought I could ever learn) are about ſome few Points in *Diſcipline*, in which ſure there is leſſe danger than in *Doctrine*, of which they diſpute not.

Firſt, they would admit none as members of their Aſſemblies, generally to partake with them in all the Ordinances, but ſuch which ſeem *Believing Saints*, and ſo members of Chriſts true Church.

Secondly, they conceive every ſeverall congregation (rightly conſtituted) hath within it ſelf *the power of the Keys*, committed to it, without dependence on other Churches: Yet not denying the lawful aſſociation of ſeveral Churches, nor refuſing the advice and council of Councils and Synods.

I ſhall crave leave to ſcan the firſt, and ſee how much it differeth in truth, from the received Tenets of the Church of *England*.

I do conceive that *England*, *Scotland*, *France*, all Churches, even *Rome* it ſelf, will agree in this, that a Church is *Cœtus Fidelium*, *A Company of Beleivers, Gathered together in the Name and power of Chriſt, to wait on him, in the way of his Ordinances revealed in his Word.* In this I ſuppoſe we all agree, where then is that *Chaſma*, that great

great Gulf of difference, which brands so many with the black spot of *Separation*?

All the difficulty lies in stating who are believing Faithful Saints, for of these only all agree, a true Church consists. I beseech you let us call him a Believer, and a Saint, whom the Scripture calls so, and we shall soon agree.

The Pope saith, he is a faithful Saint, and a true member of the Church; *Who believeth as the Church believeth.*

The Church of *England* saith, he is a Believer (enough to make a Member of that Church,) that *professeth the truth*, though in his life he deny it.

Those men say he is a faithful Saint who *professeth the truth*, and to all appearance (for we cannot see the heart) practiseth as he professeth.

Now all men will agree, this last is a Believing Saint: And these will have none but this to be a Saint; and so none but this to be a Member of Christs Church.

I beseech you, is this such an error, to desire *Profession* and *practice* to be conjoyned in one that is to be a Member of the Church of Christ?

When I desire a good Wife, a faithful Servant, a constant Friend, a familiar companion; am I not as desirous to know

the Heart as well as the Head, the Will, as well as Skill, Affection as well as Profeſſion? And why then may I not do as much in chooſing my Spiritual Friends; my conſtant companions in the worſhip and ſervice of God?

Can any man, by right, force me to marry ſuch or ſuch a woman, to take ſuch a ſervant, to dwell with ſuch a friend, to chooſe ſuch a companion? And may any man force me then to be companion, in the neereſt and moſt intimate converſe of Spirituall Ordinances, with any one or more whom I dare not, I cannot, I may not truſt, to be either friends to God or me; becauſe, what ere their lips profeſſe, their life and ways deny God, trample on the blood of Chriſt, deſpiſe, at leaſt profane all his Ordinances.

I could heartily wiſh ſome pity might be ſhewed to theſe poor mens ſouls. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to his own Soul.* And is it not then much better to keep theſe men off (as they do in *Scotland* and other Reformed Churches) till they give the Church ſatisfaction upon good ground of their repentance and faith; that ſo they may not hurt themſelves by Gods holy Ordinances?

Sacra-

Sacraments confirm, but do not conferr Grace; if they did ſo, the caſe were altered; but now they are like the Paradiſe of God, guarded with the *Flaming Sword*; ſo that the Tree in the midſt of the Garden, (which is Chriſt) cannot be touched by prophane hands.

The other Grand Hereſie (men ſo much cry againſt) in *Seperation*, is the *Independence* of their Congregations, as it was ſtated before.

But why ſhould the *Independence* of One aſſembly, to a *Province*, or *Nation*, be more *Schiſmatical*, than that of a *Province* or *Nation*, to the whole *World*? Why may not *Geneva* be as *Independent* to *France*, as *France* may be to the other parts of *Europes* Continent? In *Geneva*, why may not one Congregation, be as independent to all *Geneva* beſides, as *Geneva* is to all *France* beſides? Doth indeed ſuch a wall, or River, or Sea, ſo limit and bound the Church within it, that it may be independent on any Church without it; and may not one Congregation within this River be as well independent on all other aſſemblies within the ſame River or Sea?

Are there not ſome ſparklings of this Truth, even amongſt us in *England*? Have not we *Peculiars*? ſome Congregations

exempt from the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop within whoſe Dioceſſe they be? And I think no Separatiſt deſireth more than this, That all Pariſhes (I mean all Congregations) ſhould be *Independent Peculiars*.

Suppoſe an Eaſt-Indi-Merchants Ship be caſt on ſome remote Iſland, beyond *China*, where there ſhall be no Inhabitant; may not in this caſe the men of this Ship gather together, chooſe out ſome one or more (of themſelves) to Read, Preach, Adminiſter the Sacraments? is not this a true Church, and ſo to be reputed while they believe the Truth, and do what they believe? Is there any one Eſſentiall part wanting to this Church, ſo Conſtituted?

If it be anſwered affirmatively, that there is yet wanting ſome Eſſentiall; I rejoyn, then it is not a true Church; nay, ſo far from being *vera Eccleſia*, a true Church, that it is not *verè Eccleſia*, truly a Church: For he is not *verè Homo*, truly a man, that wants ſomething *Eſſentiall* to Man: nor is it *verè Eccleſia*, truly a Church, that wants any thing *Eſſentiall* to a *Church*.

If it be yielded that in ſuch a caſe there is nothing Eſſentiall wanting to This Church:

Church: I will again ſuppoſe that within a year or two, another Engliſh Ship be caſt on the ſame very Iſland, and have ſuch another Company, or Church; I demand now whether it be neceſſary, that both theſe Churches muſt needs join together, or at leaſt depend One on the Other?

If it be *not neceſſary*, I have what I deſire. If it be *neceſſary*, then was not the former Church a *True Church*; becauſe it wanted ſomething *Eſſential* and *Neceſſary* to a *Church*; to wit, *Dependence* on ſome other Church.

If it be ſaid, This Church did before depend on the whole *Catholick Church*, I will not gainſay it; ſo they mean only thus much, that *This Church was a true member of the True Church or Body of Chriſt*; which is but made up of ſo many particular Congregations, as mans body of its particular members. And ſo this will be no more than to ſay, All the members of the Body are parts of the Body, and *conjoined* together; but only *ſubordinate* to the Head. For, I ſuppoſe no man will ſay One of my *hands* is dependent on the Other; but both (as all the other members dependent on my *Head*: ſo are all particular Churches (I mean Congrega-

tions) dependent on their General Head, *Chriſt*, but not on other their fellow members.

If any man ſhall ſay, that *Hands* depend, not onely on the *Head*, but alſo on the *Arms*, *Shoulders*, and *Neck*, which are between them and the *Head*, on whom they ultimately depend.

I anſwer, It is true, the *Hands* are *conjoined* to the *Arms*; Theſe to the *Shoulders*; and both by the *Neck* to the *Head*: but yet They *depend* not on any but the *Head*. I mean they are not directed and guided by the Dictates of *Arms*, *Shoulders*, or *Neck*, but only by the commands of the *Head*: ſo that there is only a bodily outward Continuity, and no virtuall *Dependence*, but on the *Head*. The *Head* ſends out *Animal Spirits*, and by them guids my *Hand*, as my fancy pleaſeth. This Guiding or Directing *Depends* onely on the *Head*, not *Arm*, which (when I mean to move my *Hand*) is but as it were my *Hands Servant*, that muſt go and call and lead my *Hand* (as a Gentleman-Uſher) but not command it.

So are alſo all the Churches, all ſeverall congregations; They are all members, and are all outwardly conjoined one to another (through all the world) by the

tendons

tendons and *ligaments* of Rivers, Seas, Hills, Vallies, and the like. Yea, and ſome of theſe are neerer to Chriſt their Head, as they keep themſelves purer, and walk more cloſely in dependence on him. Yet all theſe Churches are but *coordinate*, not among themſelves *ſubordinate*. They are but conjoined each to other, not dependent each on other, but All on their Head; which alone can command and move them. Yea, though perhaps ſome one Church may come between Chriſt and another Church (as the Arm between the Head and Hand) yet it is there but as a ſervant to call on, lead, help, uphold, (being ſo commanded by the Head) but not to command, dictate, or over-top its fellow-members.

You ſee here what Power we give to Synods and Councils, or all other Churches over one particular Church; to wit, a counſelling, perſwading (which ſure is very prevailing) but not commanding Authority.

I doubt not but Chriſt doth ſometimes require one Church to incite, exhort, admoniſh, and perſwade another fellow-Church (though this be not required of any one Angel in the Apocalyps, towards another Church or Angel, yet I ſuppoſe it

may

may be in ſome caſes) yea, and ſo that the Other Church may haply ſin if ſhe do not follow this *call* and *council*: yet not becauſe it comes from her fellow-Church, (or any Synod) but becauſe it comes from Chriſt her Head, that ſpeaks through this Church to her fellow. As the Hand might juſtly be ſtiled rebellious that rejects the Animal Spirits ſent from the Head, though they come *through* the Arm; Which is here in this caſe not only a ſervant to the *Head*, but to the *Hand* alſo.

Yet doth not the *Hand* rebel, becauſe it refuſeth that which comes from the *Arm*, but becauſe it came from the *Head*, but through the *Arm* as an Inſtrument. For if ever the *Arm* impoſe ought on the *Hand* which comes not from the *Head*, (as it doth ſometimes in a flux of putrid humors from an ulcer in the *Arm*) in this caſe the *Arme* erres in ſo impoſing on the *Hand*, but the *Hand* rebells not in rejecting what the *Arm* ſo ſends: becauſe it comes not from the *Head*. On which (and on which alone) all the members virtually *depend*, and not on any one or more fellow-members.

All this while, though we diſpute the Independency of Churches amongſt themſelves; yet we have not the leaſt

ſhadow

ſhadow of a Thought to withdraw any Church from the *Civil Magiſtrate*; Nay, Theſe men (whom our Biſhops brand ſo with Separation) moſt cordially affirme, that if *Epiſcopacy* can prove greater or better *ſubjection*, or but equal to them, they will not ſcruple to ſubſcribe to them.

But alas, if we once give way to *Dependence* of *Churches*, muſt not the Church of *England* depend on the *Dutch*, or the *Dutch* on *England*; as much as one Church in *England* muſt depend on a *Provincial* Church of *Canterbury*, or *National* in all *England*?

And if the Engliſh Church muſt depend on the *Dutch*, or *Dutch* on *Engliſh*; which ſhall be *Inferior*? This, or That? by this diſpute of *Precedency*, we ſhall at length caſt all Churches into ſuch a confuſion, as ſome of our Biſhops Sees were heretofore, for ſuperiority. *Pompeius non admittit ſuperiorem, Cæſar non parem*, *Pompey* could not endure a ſuperior, nor *Cæſar* an equal. And now I conceive *York* is inferior to *Canterbury*, *Durham* to *York*, not by any Law Morall, or of Nature, but poſitive of State.

Yea, by this *Dependence* will follow a far greater Evil than this Diſpute and confuſion about *Precedency*: For if One whole

whole Church muſt ſo depend on another, then muſt alſo the Officers of this depend on Thoſe of That Church; And if ſo, ſhall not all Church-Officers return to the Pope at length, as to One Supreme Head on earth.

If *Geneva* depend on *France*, why not *France* on *Spain*? *Spain* on *Italy*? *Italy* on *Rome*? *Rome* on the Pope? And had I begun a great deal lower, I ſhould have come up higher to this Head.

Perhaps all the *Inconveniences* that can be objected on *Independence*, though they could not be anſwered (as I conceive they may) will not ballance this one inconvenience of *Dependence*: but no more of this.

The next Grand inconvenience that may be feared on the removal of our Prelates is, *Licentia Prædicandi*, a liberty of Preaching, not only in that ſenſe in which this phraſe is uſed beyond the Seas, and was in that ſenſe forbidden under our laſt Royall King *James*, That was *Licentia quoad Materiam*, A liberty in regard of the ſubject matter; This *quoad Perſonam*, in regard of the perſon.

Now they ſay, not onely every *matter* will be preached, what every Miniſter pleaſeth, but alſo every *Perſon* will turn *Preacher*

Preacher: even Shoomakers, Coblers, Feltmakers, and any other.

God is the God of Order, and not of Confuſion. And if Order is to be obſerved any where, it is ſure in matter of *Worſhip*: For if through the Churches default diſorder break in, at any cranny, you ſhall find the Breach grow wider and wider every day: Except the Cleft be ſtopt, the Ship may quickly ſinke. And therefore I ſhall wholly agree, and joyn with them that endeavour with the firſt, to allay the very ſemblance and apparition (leſſe than the leaſt bubling up) of *Diſorder*.

Onely this I could heartily wiſh, that Fire and Fagot may not determine this Controverſie, that theſe men may not be dealt with, as here ſome of the Martyrs in Queen *Maries days*; for oft when the Biſhops could not reply, they would ſtart up and ſwear by the *Faith of their body*, that this was a dangerous, groſſe, and Hereticall opinion: And all this was but a Prologue to that Tragedy, whoſe Epilogue was Flame and Fagot; or at leaſt the *Faſces*, a bundle of rods to younger men.

We have oft ſeen ſome of theſe Preachers before the higheſt Tribunall in this King-

Kingdom; for we thought it unreasonable (with those in the *Acts*) to condemn any before they were heard.

I was not their Judge alone, nor will I be at this time. Only that it may appear I attended their pleading (as it becomes any in a Court of Justice) I will give the World an account, what those men say for themselves; and so I shall leave them to be judged by wise men.

First, they conceive there be some Ordinances which are proper onely to the *Church* and *Church-Officers*, belonging only to Church Assemblies (such as is the Administration of Sacraments, the conferring of Orders, and all of this nature) These they think *Sacred*, such as may not be touched by any but Church-Officers; and of these they say, let *Uzza* take heed how he touch the *Ark*, though it shake.

But there are other Ordinances (they say) of a middle nature; as they are exercised in a Church-Assembly, by Church-Officers, they may truly be called *Church-Ordinances*: yet are such as may be used out of Church-Assemblies, and therefore probably by other than Church-Officers, As Praying, Reading the Scripture, Catechising, Exhortation, and the like; which (as they conceive) are not confined to the

Church

Church onely, or *Church-Officers.*

1. Becauſe Heathens and Publicans may be admitted, nay, ought to be invited, to theſe Ordinances. And it ſeems no Mortal ſin, for a Lay-man in *China*, to call together a company of Heathens, and Preach to them the Chriſtian Religion, yet here is no true Church, till a Congregation will embrace this Doctrine, and join in ſerving God.

2. They conceive our State, by publick Authority, hath and doth allow ſo much as this. For they ſee Clerks (even in publick Aſſemblies) Read Pſalms, Prayers, and oft ſome parts of Scripture; Deacons Preach, yea, and *Baptize*, and help to adminiſter the Lords Supper; and yet no man takes them for compleat Miniſters: yea, of old, and perhaps now alſo by Law, they are not at all Clergy-men.

3. Former Preachers have taught them, that every Maſter of a Family, may, and muſt read, pray, chatechiſe, and the like, in his own Family, if he have none there that can do it better than himſelf. Therefore theſe ſeem to come under the notion of Private Duties rather than Publick Church-Ordinances; though ſometime they be performed in Churches, yet other times they may be performed out

of

of Churches, and by thoſe that are not publick Church-Officers.

Therefore theſe poor men (through their weakneſſe) think ſuch Ordinances free to be performed by any Chriſtian, whether of the Clergy, or Laity. And their zeal makes them conceive, if God gives Gifts of Underſtanding, Memory, Judgement, and Utterance, and an earneſt deſire to do good with theſe (leſt they wrap up their talent in a Napkin) They have the Main (to wit, an inward) Call to perform theſe Duties in their own Families: or elſewhere, if they have an outward Call too.

For they ſolemnly profeſſe, they hold it not fit to preſſe or intrude themſelves on any Congregation: But if any will come of themſelves, either to their own Families, or ſend for them, and deſire to hear them, among ſome good men, they take this for a call, an outward call, to perform thoſe Duties, to that Congregation. For, they think the wayes of God's Spirit are free, and not tyed to an Univerſity man; ſo that having an inward call, they conceive the deſire of any one Congregation, is outward call ſufficient, though the Biſhop call not.

Yea,

Yea, ſome Exerciſes in God's Worſhip, they think there be, which are warranted from the Gift that enables, and not from the Call that invites: ſo that a man whom God hath enabled with Parts and Gifts, might uſe them, though no man living call him. And this alſo is the judgement of many Learned men; as of that Ingenuous, Worthy, Learned Man Maſter *Thorndicke*, of late touching on that of the *Corinths*.

So long then as they encroach not on Ordinances appropriate to Church-Officers, they think they ſin not in performing other Duties, where there are none that can, or will perform them better. They have learned Latine enough to ſay, *Bonum quo Communius, eo melius*, What is Good, is made better by the Commonneſs. They have read of *Moſes*, wiſhing all the Lords People were Prophets; and that God would pour out his Spirit on them all.

Yea, they have heard, that God promiſed to pour out his Spirit upon all Fleſh, all Believers (as well Lay as Clergy) ſo that Young men ſhould ſee Viſions, and Old men dream Dreams; and though this were begun to be accompliſhed even in our Saviour's Time, yet they

(perhaps through ignorance) Expect it ſhould be yet ſtil more and more accompliſhed every day, til Knowledge cover the Earth, as Waters fill the Sea; even till there be no more need that any man ſhould teach his neighbour, for all men ſhall know the Lord; and they poor men expect a new Heaven, and a new Earth, wherein there ſhall need no more Temples of ſtone, but all good men ſhall be Prophets, Prieſts, and Kings. In the mean time, they ſay, waters muſt flow out of the bellies of all that believe, till at length the great Waters of the Sanctuary flow forth without meaſure.

Yea, they are much encouraged from the Practice of the Church in the *Acts*, *c.*8.4. & 11.19. where all the members, Every believer being ſcattered by perſecution, went about preaching.

If it be Objected that this was an Extraordinary caſe; at the firſt beginning of the Church, and in time of perſecution, &c.

They anſwer, that they conceive almoſt as Extraordinary caſe in This Land, at This Time; Where the Church is ſo much unſetled, and hath been ſo much perſecuted. In ſome places they ſee no Miniſters; ſcarce any in ſome whole Shires,

as

as in *Cumberland*, *Weſtmorland*, *Northumberland*, and eſpecially, in *Wales*: Where the Church is even yet ſcarce (*& ne vix*) ſo much as well begun to be planted, or the Goſpel preached.

In other places where there is ſome ſhew of a Church, ſome Ordinances, ſome *Miniſters*; yet even here they think the Church calleth for many more Miniſters, at leaſt for much more, and much better preaching than it yet hath.

Specially ſince the laſt cruell Tyranny of ſome Lording Prelates, hath almoſt quite put down Ordinances, ſilenced Good Miniſters, and forbidden Preaching; Having ſo detained the Truth (and ſmothered it by unrighteouſneſſe) that there is ſcarce left the Face of a true Church. They conceive this an extraordinary time, an extraordinary Caſe, and Call, for all that are enabled by God, with Parts and Gifts, fit for ſuch exerciſes.

And they conceive 30, or 40, or an 100 Good men of any one or more Congregations, to be as Fit Judges of their parts and abilities every way, as one Lord Biſhop and his ignorant (perhaps Drunken) Chaplain; who makes ſcruple of admiting any to Orders, but Bowers and Cringers,

ſinks of Superſtition. Yet when they pleaſe, they can poſe in an Ale-houſe, and lay hands (well quickened with Angels) on Tapſters, Coblers, Butchers, and many ſuch, that are ſo far from the ſmell of a Colledge, that they never ſaw an A B C, or Pimmer to purpoſe, much leſſe a *Ferula* in a Grammar-School.

In the laſt place, they ſolemnly profeſſe they are ready to hear or read, any that either by writing, preaching, or private diſcourſe ſhall inform them better than now they ſee or know. They would thank any man that will ſatisfie their Conſciences, and convince their judgement: For they profeſſe they are not acted by vain-glory, or Faction, but Conſcience, and deſire of propagating Truth, and ſpreading the Goſpel, as God ſhall give them opportunities.

And ſuppoſing ſuch parts, gifts, and abilities, fit for thoſe duties; they conceive no man may upbraid them with poverty, or former living in a Trade; which yet they think not altogether incompatible to Preaching: For they have read of St. *Paul* (and others) intermixing his Sermons with making of Tents.

Yea,

Yea, though they have not ſuch parts and gifts as St. *Paul*; yet they think the work of Preaching much more compatible with all works of the Hands, than with any one other ſtudy of the brain, or mind: and yet they ſee many Civil Lawyers take Livings, and have the Cure of Souls: Yea, and all their Lord Biſhops have Two Callings, Two ſeverall (oppoſite) Studies; and yet for all thoſe Two, they can ſpend as much, or more time at Cards and Dice (or worſe) than at either of their Callings.

Nor are they ſo tyed to their outward Callings, but if the Church ſhall think it fit, they are ready to give up all, and apply themſelves wholly to the ſtudy of Scriptures, and work of the Miniſtery.

In the mean time they follow their *Callings*, (not living idlely, or going up and down tatling as Buſie-bodies) but being diligent to ſerve God both with their hands, hearts alſo, yea, and tongues too, if God ſhall call them, and give opportunity as well as abilities.

I would not be miſtaken by my Reader. All this time I am ſpeaking *Their words*, not *my own*; All that I deſire is, That they may have a fair Hearing, before

they be ſeverely cenſured. And I move this the rather, becauſe they are ſtil ready to ſay, Moſt that condemn them never heard them: I could not but do what in me lies to remove this ſcandall.

It may be Expected I ſhould now ſhew my owne Opinion; and anſwer all Theſe Things, which thoſe poor men ſay for themſelves. But I muſt confeſſe I am already almoſt tyred with relating the arguments of one part only; ſo that I dare not ſet on the other.

Neither indeed do I think it needfull; Moſt of That which They ſay, being ſuch, that it is not like to do much hurt; and ſo I think it not needful to refute it. What muſt be refuted, may much better be done by others of better parts, and ſounder judgements; For I know ſome that in one poor diſcourſe of *Truth*, are by their wit able to find all the ſeventeen *Intellectuall Sins*; how much more in a diſcourſe of Error?

Onely by the way, I cannot but ſhew how weakly theſe poor Preachers anſwer ſome ſtrong Objections brought againſt them.

As this in the Firſt place: That by this Courſe, All Errors and Hereſies ſhall quickly come to be vented and maintained

tained in the Church, when every man may Preach that *will*, and what he will, without controul.

To This Argument, All their Anſwer, that I can remember, is this.

Firſt, that they maintain not, that any man may Preach that *Will*. No; they ſay it muſt be One of Parts, Gifts, and Abilities fit for a Preacher; and that not onely in his own fancy, but in the Judgement of many Godly men: Who (being many) are as like to be fit and able to judge of Abilities on Their Tryall, as any One Biſhops Chaplain; that yet uſeth to preſent to his Lord, after little or no poſing, One whom he never heard ſpeak (much leſſe Preach or Pray) before he came for *Holy Orders*.

Secondly, they ſay, They maintain not, that any ſuch man (ſo Gifted and Called, being judged fit by the votes of many) may yet Preach *what he will*. No, they are as much limited and kept within bounds, as if they were licenſed by the Biſhop.

For, if he Preach falſe Doctrine, either in matters of Church, or State, they ſay the Biſhops Keyes, or at leaſt his Long Sword, may reach him as well in a Parlour, or ſome little Pulpit, as if he were

a *Licentiate* in a great Cathedral. And if he Preach no falſe Doctrine, muſt he ſuffer (ſay they) for Preaching True?

It is true, No wiſe man living will blame (much leſſe puniſh, or fine) a man that ſpeakes a good True Diſcourſe of *Law*, or *Phyſicke*, though he be *Licentiate* in neither; But theſe poor men conſider not, the caſe is not the ſame in Preaching a True diſcourſe in Divinity. Yet let us give way, and they will ſpeak more.

Again they ſay, Suppoſe they did hold (which they do not) that any man living might Preach that would, and what he would; yet perhaps there would not follow ſo great Inconvenience as ſome imagine.

For, All ſuch ſuppoſed Preachers are either *Wiſe* men, or *Fools*. If *Wiſe*, they will preach *Wiſely*, and ſo do *Good*. If *Fools*, *Fooliſhly*, and ſo do no *Hurt*, or at leaſt very little hurt: For, it is not for a *Fool* to broach an Hereſie and maintain it, or ſpread it much. No, *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Arminius*, and ſuch, were men of the greateſt parts, but ſet wrong.

Yea, ſuppoſe ſome of theſe *Non-Licentiate* Preachers be men of the greateſt Parts poſſible

poſſible, and ſo poſſible to become dangerous Hereticks; Doth the Hereſie ſpread it ſelf the more for not being *Licenſed?* Might not this Great man do as much hurt (yea much more) if he were licenſed, than now he is not?

If any anſwer, It is true, He is like to do more hurt, if licenſed; but therefore the Biſhop in wiſdome will not licenſe him.

They rejoyn: Firſt, is it probable one Biſhop in this Caſe will ſhew more Care and Conſcience, than 20 or 30 good men in a Congregation, where this parted man would preach?

But again, Suppoſe there be never a Good man in all his Auditory; or that all the Good men there, will not have care to ſuppreſſe this man from doing hurt: How ſhall, how can the Biſhop do this? How can he keep him from venting, and ſpreading this Hereſie?

Firſt, when this man comes for a Licenſe to the Biſhop, No man can tell how he means to preach, (when he is licenſed) except the Biſhop perchance be a Prophet alſo, as well as a Prieſt and King?

Either he hath preached, (before his coming for this Licenſe) or he hath not.

If

If he have not, No Biſhop can tell how he will preach, nor can any wiſe man living commend him to the Biſhop, as fit to make a good Preacher: ſince he that is the beſt Scholar living, and perhaps as good a man as any, yet may prove but an ill Preacher.

If he have preached before, and done well, without Licenſe, then it ſeems it is lawful to preach without a Licenſe: for probation no doubt, (though moſt of late have denied this.) But I ask, how long ſhall he be a Probationer? how many yeares, moneths, weeks? Though he preach ten good Sermons, no man can tell, but in the next he means to broach an Hereſie.

But alas, Theſe poor men ſee not how weak all this is. For, Is it not eaſie for three or four men, or a Biſhops Chaplain to commend a man (be he a Scholar, or Groom, or Butler, or what he will:) let the Biſhop without ſeeing, or ſmelling this man, give him his bleſſing blind-fold, and ſeal him a *Licenſe*, What hurt is in all This? For if this man preach well, the Church will get good: if ill, cannot the Biſhop as ſoon pull him down again, as he ſet him up?

They anſwer, Suppoſe he may, (which is hard to ſuppoſe, ſince Orders once given

given, leave an *Indelible Character*) why may not ten or twenty men, Good men in a Congregation, as well set up a man, and try how he will prove? For if well, it is well; he will do good: If ill, these ten or twenty men can as easily pull him down again, as set him up.

Not so. For the Bishop is still a very wise, discreet, good, holy man; and being entrusted by the Church, will have a speciall care, even more than a hundred others, to set up a good man, or else pull him quickly down.

To this they yet answer, The Bishop cannot tell how, or what he preacheth when he hath set him up, (except he can be present in all places, at least many at once to hear all young Preachers that he licenseth;) and therefore though he would pull him down, yet he cannot, because he cannot be still present to hear him. Though he come once, twice, ten times, yet the Preacher may hold in all his Heresie, till he see the Bishop absent, and sometimes he must be absent.

But may not the Congregation then go and complain to the Bishop if their Preacher do amisse? and upon complaint the Bishop will, may, and must suppresse that error.

If

If he do not (they say) they are still where they were. But if he do censure this Preacher, on the complaint of the Congregation; Either he sees they complain injustly (and then he doth injustice in censuring upon an unjust complaint) or else he must yield they complain justly; and then he also grants, that this Congregation hath wisdom enough to judge, whether a man preach well, or ill; and if so, why may not the Congregation censure him for ill preaching, without complaint to one Bishop?

Sed frustra fit per plura; quod fieri potest per pauciora. And so I leave this, and come to another great Question that is wont still to be propunded to these poor *Non-Licensed* Preachers.

It is this, why (if indeed they be fit, or seem fit, or do but think themselves fit to be Ministers, why then) do they not enter into *Orders?* or at least present themselves, shewing their desire to be in Holy *Orders*, if indeed they may be found fit for the Ministery, as they thinke themselves? Why do they halt between two? either let them serve the Church wholly, and so be in Orders; or else let them forbear, and not meddle with dispensing of Holy Ordinances.

This

This seemed to me a very serious Question, and therefore I much desired to hear their answers.

Some of them say, they know not yet whether they be worthy, or fit to take on them Those Greater Offices which follow, Orders, only they desire they may have leave, (as Probationers) to exercise, or keep Acts before the Church; till the Church shall approve of them, and call them out, judging them faithfull) for higher employment, or generally to dispense all the Ordinances. In the mean time, they meddle only with such Ordinances, as they conceive not proper to Church Officers only, but in some sort common to all Christians, yea, to all men, as was said before.

Others say, they would gladly (with all their Hearts be consecrated to God, and wholly give themselves up to his service and worship in the Ministry, but they are afraid to take *Orders*, as *Orders* are now conferred in This State. And yet in the mean time, they dare not abstain from preaching, (where they have opportunity, and a Willing Auditory) lest they should detain the Truth, God hath revealed to them; and should be guilty of hiding their Talent in a Napkin. For they think

think they may do many things belonging (though not proper) to a Minister; though they be not, nor can be (as things now stand) in holy Orders. Their Instance is *David*, who was a King, and of the Tribe of *Judah*, and so could be neither Priest nor Levite; yet they find King *David* often *Preaching*; else they understand not the meaning of those Phrases, *O come hither, and I will shew you what the Lord hath done for my poor soul*, and the like.

If these men in this be serious, and do not pretend Conscience, where it is some other Principle, that acts them to some low end: I cannot but much pity them; that if they be fit, they neither may be licensed, nor yet Preach without License. But let us see why they dare not enter into Orders, and so be Licensed Ministers.

They answer, that they have not so much against Orders conferred by our Church, or the manner of conferring them, (though under some Bishops, This hath been very strange, and not warrantable either by Law of God or man, they conceive) as they have in their judgement and consciences, against the Power conferring them.

For

For they doubt not to affirm, That He (whoever he be) that taketh on himself power, which the Scripture hath not given him, to appoint, dictate, or command, any one thing, either in Doctrine or Discipline, though the thing it self might possibly be good; yet He that so dictates, is *Antichristian*, encroaching on the Regal Office of Christ; and so a *Traytor* in Religion.

Now they dare not touch that, which (how good soever in it self, yet) comes in Power and Virtue of an Antichristian Traytor. Yea, though such a one should command them a thing very lawfull in it self, (as to wear a black Cloath) yet if He have not Commission to command, from Scripture, they conceive he incurs a *Præmunire* with God; because he takes on him to do that (as an Officer) for which he is not *fore-armed with lawfull Authority*. In this case they think they ought not to obey Him so commanding: because though the thing in it self be lawfull to be done, yet they think him an unlawful Commander, and so dare not obey; if for no other Reason, yet for this, That by obeying here, they shall betray not only their own Priviledges, (which yet are very precious) but also

the

the Liberties and Priviledge of all the Subjects of Chriſt, even of the whole Church, ſo that they become Traytors to their ſpiritual Common-wealth.

They give this inſtance in Civil Things. Suppoſe a Sheriff, that is a lawfull Officer, come and command me to give him forty pound, of his own head, without lawfull Authority to back his Command; they ſay, if in this caſe I give him forty ſhillings, I betray not onely my own priviledge (which perhaps I may do) but alſo the whole Liberty of the Common-wealth, and ſo become (*in Re*) a Traytor to the State: though in it ſelf it be lawful to give forty ſhillings to any man that asks; yet now I muſt not do it, becauſe this Officer commands it by unlawful authority, and ſo without Commiſſion.

Nor yet that they think it neceſſary to ſtay diſputing the Authority of a Commander, there where is no appearance of Ground for a doubt. But if once they ſee and know the command is grounded on no lawful Authority; or do but really doubt whether the *Power commanding*, or the *Thing commanded* be lawfull: They conceive themſelves bound to abſtain till their judgement be cleered, (which they profeſſe

profeſſe to deſire, and by all lawful means to endeavour) leſt while they do, they be condemned in their own conſciences, becauſe they do not act in *Faith*: *and what is not of faith is ſin.*

I muſt leave theſe Things to be diſcuſſed by men of better judgements. In the mean time I humbly deſire again I may not be miſ-underſtood; for it is not in my thoughts to abet the leaſt miſcarriage in any one of theſe poor men: nor by any means to countenance any of them, in a way of exerciſing thoſe Duties which are too high for their parts, and abilities which God hath given them. Yet if there be any of them that have extraordinary parts and endowments of Judgement, memory, and utterance; if God ſtir up theſe to improve their Gifts to the beſt advantage, yet with all meekneſſe and humility, I dare not condemn them till I hear them: for I know the Spirit of God is not tied to our Fancies, but yet the *Spirit of the Prophets is ſubject to the Prophets.*

I take not on me to warrant all the paths which ſome cut out to themſelves: Yet I moſt affectionately entreat men not to contemn all things in thoſe they now brand with their uſual ſtain of *Separatiſm*;

which phraſe many uſe in ſuch ſcorn, as if with one ſtab (of that Italian dagger) they could run through Body and Soul at once.

Theſe whom they ſo brand may maintain ſome errors, may not carry on the truth in the glory of it; who is ſo perfect? but oft-times in the midſt of thickeſt ore we find the pureſt gold: diſcover their errors and reject them; but do not refuſe what is good becauſe they hold it forth but darkly: no truth can ſhine in its perfect luſtre at the firſt: light is darkneſſe when it firſt appeareth.

Yet *Light* was on the firſt Creatures, and yet not perfected til the fourth Day, (and perhaps not fully then;) ſo was ſpiritual *Light*, the beginning of *Reformation*, That *New Creation*; yet it was not perfect at firſt dawning, but encreaſeth ſtil by degrees, til it have quite chaſed away darkneſſe, and there be no more Night. All men yield there muſt be an encreaſe of light in the world; Now whether that be more probable to be in *Doctrine*, or *Diſcipline*, judge yee.

At the firſt Riſing out of Popery; the Church-leſſe Church of the *Albigenſes*, and *Waldenſes*, (Holy Good men) began an admirable Reformation. This was much

much advanced by *Jerome* of *Prague*, and *John Hus*, *Luther* had many grosse errors, yet must not lose his place among these glorious Lights. After These appeareth *Calvin*, shining yet brighter both in Doctrine and Discipline. Since him our God hath raised up a more glorious Light among these Northern Isles. And yet some went from us lately with a candle burning brighter perhaps than ours; though it were lighted here. Thus Light dilating and enlarging it self, seemeth to become more pure, more Light, more Glorious; and yet it soemes not to be Noon. The Light still, will, must, cannot but encrease; why then do we shut our eyes? Let it not be said of us, that Light came in and grew up amongst us, yet we would not use it (for we cannot but receive it) because we loved darkness.

But why do I wonder? If these things which are by many held but ceremoniall or circumstantial truthes, are thus slighted, seeing the sweet workings of the Spirit, Truths of a more glorious Nature, are not onely under-valued, but opposed, even by those who love Christ; it is a strange thing, men call, men long for new things; and yet if any do hold

forth new and quick actings of the Spirit, they fall under cenſure of thoſe who forget that Text, Judge not, leſt you be Judged. Thus many times, good men do not only neglect, but abuſe light, yea, they do both grieve and quench God's Holy Spirit. A ſad caſe! and ſo are ſtill in ſome part carnall; and the Fleſh not only luſteth, but warreth againſt the Spirit.

We are too apt to ſlight the ſweet breathings of Gods Spirit, which he is pleaſed to communicate to others when we are deſtitute of the ſame Workings. Some Chriſtians are as it were wholly legall; they Faſt, they Pray, receive Sacraments, hear Sermons, pay every one his own, live in-offenſively: This is well done, but This is not All: yet this they take for enjoying God in Chriſt Jeſus. But alas! *Quantum diſtat ab illo*, How far from that is it? *Non eſt vivere, ſed valere vita*, Life conſiſts in being healthful, and not barely in living. Theſe men may well be ſaved hereafter, but in the mean time they loſe the ſweeteſt part of their life here.

On the other ſide, if God pleaſe to communicate himſelf in any manner of ſweetneſſe, ſo that a man begins to taſte

and

and see how good Communion and acquaintance with God is; how easily it is interrupted by loose walking; how sweet it is when enjoyed; so that it ravisheth the soul, and filleth the whole Heart, that it cannot but flow out at the Lips, in sweet breathings of, for, and after God in Christ Jesus, God in Christ Jesus. This man is presently stained with a taint of *Madnesse*, and I know not what *Enthusiasme*. If one that hath tasted and experimentally found the sweetnesse of Peace of Conscience, and knows how unpossible it is to keep it, but by close walking with God; how easily it is broken; and how hardly it is made up again when broken: so that he is content to leave Friends, Living, Liberty, All, rather than to break his Peace, wound his Conscience, sin against God, in sinning against light, or acting against Doubts. O that man is beyond all Rule of Reason; He hath a tang of Phrensie; one puft up with a spirit of self conceit; a Rank *Separatist*.

But sure it should not be so among Christians. Can we not dissent in judgement (specially in these lower points of *Discipline*, while we agree in *Doctrine*) but we must also disagree in *Affection*? A hard case!

I confesse there are many now that turn the Light of Truth into a Life of looſneſſe, vanity, and profaneneſſe; and we are all too too prone to This. There are ſome *Enthuſiaſticks*, who profane the Spirit. This I would reſiſt with all my might. But let not all ſuffer with the wicked. Some without warrant run away from their Callings, and take up a bare, empty, fruitleſſe Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, without the leaſt dram of life or power; Theſe men my ſoul hateth.

But when God ſhall ſo enlarge his Hand, and unvail his face, that the poor creature is brought into communion and acquaintance with his Creator: ſteered in all his wayes, by his Spirit; and by it carried up above ſhame, fear, pleaſure, comfort, loſſes, grave, and death it ſelf; Let us not cenſure ſuch Tempers, but bleſſe God for them. So far as Chriſt is in us, we ſhall love, prize, honour Chriſt, and the leaſt particle of his Image in others: For we never prove our ſelves true members of Chriſt more than when we embrace his members with moſt enlarged, yet ſtraiteſt Affections.

To this end, God aſſiſting me, my deſire, prayer, endeavour ſhall ſtill be, as much as in me lies, to follow peace and holineſs;

holineſſe; and though there may haply be ſome little diſſent between my darke judgement, weak conſcience, and other Good men, that are much more cleare, and ſtrong; yet my prayer ſtill ſhall be, to *keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.* And as many as walk after this Rule, peace I hope ſhall ſtill be on them, and the whole Iſrael of God.

FINIS.